



the international
communist
and
working-class
movement

The Revolutionary Movement of Our Time and Nationalism



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by Vic Schneierson

Group of authors:

V. Y. CHERTIKHIN

Y. N. POPOV

G. F. RUDENKO (head of group)

F. D. RYZHENKO

S. I. SEMYONOV

Y. A. SHERKOVIN

V. M. YUSHENKO

F. I. ZAKHAROV

Edited by *V. V. ZAGLADIN*

Современное революционное движение и национализм

На английском языке

First printing 1975

© Политиздат, 1973

© Translation into English. Progress Publishers 1975

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

C $\frac{10303-184}{014(01)-76}$ 92-75

CONTENTS

Preface	7
<i>Part I. NATIONALISM AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON AND POLITICAL PROBLEM</i>	<i>9</i>
Chapter I. Nationalism and the Strategy of Modern Imperialism	13
1. The "Reliance on Nationalism" Strategy	14
2. The Tactics of "Reliance on Nationalism"	19
Chapter II. Methods of Studying Modern Nationalism	24
Chapter III. Historical Varieties of Nationalism	47
Chapter IV. The Essence and Historical Content of Nationalism	69
Chapter V. The Psychology of Nationalism	92
1. The National and Nationalist in Psychology	92
2. The Social Basis of Nationalist Psychology	101
3. How the National Turns into Nationalist	110
4. Manifestations of Nationalist Psychology in the Mass Consciousness	116
<i>Part II. NATIONALISM AND THE WORLD REVOLU- TIONARY MOVEMENT</i>	<i>127</i>
Chapter VI. The World Socialist System and Nationalism	131
Chapter VII. Nationalism and the Communist Movement in the Developed Capitalist Countries	171
1. A Few Special Features of the National Element in Capitalist Countries, and Bourgeois Nationalism	172
2. Nationalist Tendencies and the Struggle Against Them in the Communist Movement of Devel- oped Capitalist Countries	190
Chapter VIII. Social and National Emancipation and Nationalism	200
1. Lenin on Types of National Self-Determination	200
2. Nationalism in Bourgeois and Petty-Bourgeois Parties in Latin America	213
3. Nationalism in the Latin American Liberation Movement	227

Chapter IX. The Afro-Asian National Liberation Movement and Nationalism	242
1. General Description of National Movements and Nationalism in Non-Socialist Asian Countries	242
2. The National Liberation Movement and Nationalism in Africa	254
Conclusion	276

PREFACE

Nationalism represents a special danger for the process of the revolutionary transformation of the world. The main function of nationalism, whatever its form, is to split, divide and fragment the international working class and also the advanced contingents of the national liberation movement. In one way or another all forms of nationalism reflect the interests of the exploiting classes.

Notwithstanding the energetic action taken against them, nationalist manifestations are still in evidence in the main revolutionary streams. Furthermore, in some detachments of the revolutionary movement they have grown into a real danger. The danger is aggravated by the fact that the capitalist ideologues and politicians increasingly utilise nationalism as one of the chief means of dispersing and weakening the forces of revolution.

The fight against nationalism in the world revolutionary movement is a many-sided and difficult process. Besides utmost vigilance against all nationalist effusions it requires maximum concern for the national—but not nationalist!—feelings and interests of all nations and nationalities, big or small.

In analysing the substance and forms of contemporary nationalism the authors have defined, and distinguished between, the categories of “national” and “nationalist”; also they have defined such derivative concepts as “national in-

terests", "nationalist interests" and "national policy" (as well as ideology, psychology, feeling, consciousness, self-awareness, etc.). Clear-cut definitions of the concepts and categories that characterise nationalism are essential for a successful struggle against it.

The authors have supplemented their theoretical study of nationalism with a concrete analysis of its manifestations in separate streams of the world revolutionary movement.

Part I

Nationalism
as a Social Phenomenon
and Political Problem

An abstract presentation of the question of nationalism in general is of no use at all. A distinction must necessarily be made between the nationalism of an oppressor nation and that of an oppressed nation, the nationalism of a big nation and that of a small nation.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 607

CHAPTER I

NATIONALISM AND THE STRATEGY OF MODERN IMPERIALISM

"...In the end communism may have to capitulate to nationalism all over the world."¹ This pronouncement by an eminent anti-communist theoretician gives voice not only to the hope, but also the faith of the imperialists in victory and in their ability to reverse the course of history, imposing surrender on the revolutionary forces. These far-reaching designs have originated among people not usually prone to illusions. Their plans of softening up and disrupting the world revolutionary movement are based on certain displays of nationalism among revolutionary forces. They intend to exploit this nationalism as their main weapon.

The existence of the world socialist system has weakened imperialism and invigorated the forces of progress. A favourable situation has arisen for the revolutionary struggles of the masses in the developed capitalist countries and for the victory of the liberation movement of oppressed peoples in colonies and dependent countries. Therefore, it is not surprising that imperialism is determined to slow up the march of history, and to disrupt the socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union, which are the mainstay of the world revolutionary process.

¹ Walter Kolarz, *Communism and Colonialism*, London, 1964, p. 12.

1. The "Reliance on Nationalism" Strategy

Capitalist politicians and ideologues are determined, and have always been so, to wipe out the revolutionary forces. This has been the basic element of capitalism's political practices since the mid-nineteenth century. "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the Powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies,"¹ wrote Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848. The march of history and the growth of the revolutionary movement have often compelled the captains of the capitalist world to alter their strategy and tactics, and the forms and scope of their "holy alliance". For a long time their main weapon had been *direct force*: cloak and dagger, court-room and prison, banning of revolutionary parties, ruthless suppression of uprisings in colonies, armed intervention against the world's first socialist country followed by an economic blockade, the fascist attack on the Soviet Union, and then the post-war preparations of a new world war against the socialist countries. Though varied, all these methods were based on direct and undisguised force.

But now the correlation of the forces of progress and revolution, and those of the old world, has changed to capitalism's disadvantage. Bourgeois politicians are aware that force alone will not win them back the historical initiative and will not yield victory over socialism.

A new period has therefore begun in imperialist strategy—force combined with politico-ideological attempts at subversion of the revolutionary movement *from within*.

The Post-War Evolution of Imperialism's Strategic Conceptions

The keynote of imperialism's present strategic conception is to exploit, and artificially aggravate, difficulties arising in the development of the socialist camp so as to eventually divide the socialist countries and get them back into the capitalist fold one by one.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, p. 108.

This is an attempt to apply to the socialist camp the old divide-and-rule principle that had often in the past helped shore up capitalist dominion.

A glance at history will show that to divide and weaken the social groups challenging their power, the exploiting classes made use of religious, tribal, caste and racial antagonisms, which they sharpened to a point of conflict and from which they benefited to buttress their rule.

But socialist countries cannot be divided by accentuating caste or tribal differences. Neither are religious differences of any use against them (though they may be effective for imperialist ends in individual cases). Racial disparities, too, do not apply in the case of the European socialist countries. Yet Europe is the region that capitalist theoreticians and politicians regard as the crucial component of the world power balance.

In the circumstances, the function of dividing the revolutionary forces has been assigned chiefly to nationalism.

World reaction picked nationalism as a basic weapon against the revolutionary forces for a very good reason. The vast majority of people, irrespective of their social background, have national feelings. Apart from being universal, these feelings are also highly sensitive. Exploiting "dangers" to national values and unfolding subversive campaigns on the plane of "national interests", imperialism can expect a massive and receptive audience and, consequently, an opportunity to misguide the public by substituting nationalist for national interests.

True, bourgeois theorists and politicians espousing the "reliance on nationalism" concept do not see eye to eye on how to use it. There are three different schools.

The extreme right wants to combine the policy of softening up the socialist system from within with possible resort to force in a favourable situation on the pretext of "liberating" the "enslaved" East European nations.

The moderate conservatives, who are the most numerous and consist chiefly of scholars "specialising" in socialism,

reject force altogether. The most effective way, as they see it, is to provoke mass rejection of socialism and thereby stimulate the growth of nationalist tendencies, pushing the East European countries gradually back to capitalism without resort to violence or war.

And the more liberal trend holds that socialism's evolution will lead to "national communisms" abandoning the internationalist idea of the world's revolutionary reconstruction. It regards restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries as unrealistic, and directs its strategy chiefly on prodding the socialist states towards "national communism".

These differences in outlook are fairly substantial. But they do not concern the *end goal* of the "reliance on nationalism" strategy.

**Theoretical
Pillars of the
"Reliance on
Nationalism"
Strategy**

The old strategic concepts of disrupting and crushing the revolutionary forces had no comprehensive theoretical foundation. Based on the use of force, they did not require the services of social scientists.

The new "reliance on nationalism" strategy, on the other hand, is not the empirical result of a revision of the old, bankrupt strategic practices, and has a theoretical basis in modern bourgeois ideas about the character of social development. And it is on these notions that bourgeois scholars are building their plans of disrupting the world revolutionary process and its composite streams.

The "scientific" foundation for the new strategy is formed chiefly by the theory of "eroding communism", the substance of which is clear from its several basic concepts.

The contradiction between the "universality" of the Marxist ideology and the fact that in practice every Marxist party must necessarily consider the national features of its country, is said to stimulate a tendency to depart from "universality" to "national communism". "National Marxisms", it is said, are bound to compete with each other in proving that they are the only authentic variety.

Unification of Marxism is said to be impossible because the national interests of different socialist countries collide, and will continue to collide.

Imperialist ideologues refer to "Moscow's hegemony" and its disregard of the national peculiarities of other countries. They claim that the leaders of some of the latter yearn to be independent of Moscow, and also list other factors of a subjective order. They spare no effort to find objective points allegedly favouring a pro-Western orientation in some socialist countries.

The East European states, they maintain, cannot get what they need for their economic development from the Soviet Union or each other. This, they add, will be the case for some time to come, compelling these countries to seek Western aid.

Trade between the socialist countries, they say, does not yield them the freely convertible currency required for purchases in the world markets, prompting the East European countries to reorientate westward.

The "technical backwardness" of Soviet industry, these theorists aver (ignoring the main trend of Soviet development and accentuating isolated facts), is another stable factor for gravitating to the West.

The pro-Western tendency of the East European socialist countries, that is, their return to the capitalist fold, they conclude, should be encouraged in every way. To promote the rapprochement with capitalism, they advocate extensive commercial ties with Eastern Europe in order to play on national interests, loosen the ties and lessen the importance of mutual assistance between the various socialist countries, and gradually alter their political course. This is also behind the benevolence shown to the "national communism" concept and the related practices.

The conclusion drawn from the "eroding communism" theory is that Marxism and its internationalism will be inevitably smothered by nationalism.

Let us for the moment leave aside the substance of this theorising. The basic propositions of the "eroding commu-

nism" theory are evidence merely of its proponents' hopes and have no foundation in reality. In this part of the book we intend to review the motives behind the actions of our opponents and to examine the various viewpoints influencing their behaviour towards the socialist world.

In recent years the "eroding communism" theory acquired a new, broader ideological base: the so-called convergence theory. The term "convergence", borrowed from natural science, connotes the appearance of a resemblance in the body structure or function of disparate organisms through their evolutionary adaptation to similar conditions. The makers of the convergence theory did not associate it directly with either the "eroding communism" theory or its offspring, the strategy of encouraging nationalism. Some of them are probably far removed from these anti-communist constructions. But objectively the convergence theory buttresses the positions of the proponents of "erosion".

The originators and propagandists of the convergence theory maintain that at a higher level of technical development the capitalist and socialist systems will objectively—i.e., irrespective of theoretical views or practices—shed their former points of disparity and acquire certain common features; ultimately, they will begin to resemble each other, and converge.

The "eroding communism" theory is thus, as it were, supported by alleged processes in material production independent of volition, ideology and social practice. The prospect of socialist and capitalist countries converging is substituted for the gradual convergence of socialist nations and, in the long term, their subsequent fusion. "National communisms" are referred to as the vehicles of this process. This explains the imperialists' encouragement of the "national communism" concept.

The erosion and convergence theories form the foundation for the "bridge-building" policy, which amounts in effect to accentuating such ties with individual socialist countries as will benefit and stimulate "national communism", encourage nationalist dissociation from the socialist

system and rupture of ties with other socialist countries. In other words, the policy of "building bridges" between capitalism and individual socialist countries is designed to tear down the bridges between the socialist countries.

Essentially, the "bridge-building" trend does not mean that reactionary imperialist politicians have completely renounced use of force to disrupt the socialist system and the world revolutionary process.

As we see, capitalist ideologists assume that they can profit from "national communism", preoccupied with purely national interests, first by confining socialism to within its present territorial frontiers, localising the revolutionary process, and then by breaking it up into many national varieties and inducing each variety to tighten its bonds with capitalism.

2. The Tactics of "Reliance on Nationalism"

The latest imperialist theoretical constructions and the "reliance on nationalism" strategy have resulted in corresponding political, ideological and military tactics, and also tactics in economic and cultural relations.

The Theoretical Principles of the "Reliance on Nationalism" Tactics

There are more and more books in the West on the principles behind these tactics. One of them, J. C. Campbell's *American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe*,¹ attracted our attention for two reasons—its wide coverage of the problems involved, and the position of its author. Dr. Campbell is an expert on Eastern Europe, and has written a number of books on the East European countries.

At the request of the sponsors of the Seventh Midwest Seminar on United States Foreign Policy (the universities

¹ J. C. Campbell, *American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe. The Choices Ahead*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1965.

of Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin), Campbell produced a paper on US policy in Eastern Europe. Subsequently, he worked his paper into a book, the one we have mentioned. He is, therefore, one of those select people who help shape the views of certain US politicians.

Apart from the "reliance on nationalism" concept, Campbell examined what he described as three potentially possible strategy variants, and studied the tactics suitable for each in all fields of public life. The first of the three variants is a projection of Dulles' "policy of liberation". The second is "reliance on nationalism", and the third is based on the contention that the split between the Soviet Union and China would prompt the former to seek closer relations with the capitalist world, enabling the East European states to follow a more independent policy.

The author obviously prefers the second variant, because he thinks it is consonant with the processes allegedly unfolding in the communist world. "The contrast with the situation a decade ago is striking," Campbell writes. "These changes have affected the methods, the instruments, and the effectiveness of Soviet control, the character and motivation of the Eastern European regimes, their relations with their own peoples, with each other, and with the West."¹

The author explains his choice. Firstly, nationalism has allegedly always existed among the East European nations and inspired them to fight for independence. Secondly, the tendency towards autonomy and self-government has in the case of the East European states become a fact of international life.

To take full advantage of nationalism's destructive potential, Campbell says, the United States must penetrate into all sectors of political, economic and cultural relations. The details are carefully studied, and the author's conclusions are interesting enough to be reproduced here at some length.

"The second line of policy, recognising the interrelationship between the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern

¹ J. C. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

Europe," the author writes, "nonetheless distinguishes between them and aims to weaken the ties that bind them together. It assumes a condition of something less than total dependence of the Eastern European regimes on Moscow and the possibility that the gulf may be widened to the breaking point, as happened with Yugoslavia in 1948. It assumes also the possibility of changes in the nature of those regimes. . . . The United States, accordingly, would maintain normal relations with the Eastern European states. It would encourage their national interests rather than the sectarian interests of their regimes, though admittedly on some issues the difference might be irrelevant or impossible to ascertain. It would offer them alternatives to exclusive reliance on Moscow, along lines that would be supported by their peoples. The policy would take form through a multiplicity of contacts and influences. In essence, it would try to rebuild the historic ties between the West and the Eastern European states, though not necessarily a military or an organic political connection. The Eastern European states might move toward a status like that of Yugoslavia, or possibly Finland or Austria. This would be a gradual process, taking place by a succession of small steps rather than by a major showdown with the Soviet Union."¹

This political strategy, as Campbell sees it, should have specific aspects in each field, determining imperialism's basic tactics.

These tactics will incline towards broad manoeuvre, flexibility and a combination of overt and covert ways of encouraging nationalist pro-Western trends. Propaganda, for example, should consist of open pleas for "independence", contrasting it to the alleged dependence, and of covert subversion designed to undermine the existing order. In trade and foreign aid the tactics should include direct expansion of imperialist economic ties with Eastern Europe, in order to weaken "dependence on Moscow", on the one hand, and a different basis for commerce and aid, distinct from the

¹ Ibid., pp. 99-100.

principles governing economic relations with the Soviet Union, on the other. Militarily, the West is advised to maintain in Europe forces big enough to oppose the Soviet Union and to agree to a mutual withdrawal of troops from all European countries in order to create "an atmosphere favourable to greater political independence".

Here we see another important feature of the imperialist orientation on nationalism: the tactics are worked out not only for every field separately, but also for each of the socialist countries separately, and even separately for the different nationalities in those countries, because what is good for one is not necessarily good, or may even be totally unacceptable, for another. Different yardsticks are recommended for the different socialist countries, which are alleged to have different motives for loosening their ties with Russia. This differentiation presupposes close and scrupulous study of the processes in the individual socialist countries in the light of the opportunities they may offer to monopoly capital.

The next specific and important element of the "reliance on nationalism" tactics is their special tonality. The older strategic concepts—the one "from positions of strength" and the concept of internal counter-revolutionary coups—were unscrupulous in choice of means and postulated undifferentiated preparations for the use of force. Urging the "reliance on nationalism" tactics, addressed to national aspirations and feelings, the capitalist theorists call for caution in order to prevent a negative reaction. "One reason is," Campbell writes, "that American initiatives have no guarantee of favourable results in these disputes among Communists which are now benefiting the West anyway; indeed, such initiatives might be counterproductive in pushing the Communist States back into a greater solidarity against the West."¹

We have examined the imperialist theory, strategy and tactics of "reliance on nationalism" to soften up the world socialist system. There is another trend: that of using nationalism to erode the progressive forces and fortify reaction

¹ J. C. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

in the capitalist world. The theoretical substantiation of the "reliance on nationalism" policy, and its strategy and tactics, change considerably in relation to different regions of the world.

While seeking to escalate nationalist ideas in the socialist world and disrupt its unity, imperialist ideologists combat nationalism in the capitalist world wherever it runs counter to the idea of cosmopolitan domination by the financial oligarchy.

This is more than enough reason for Marxists to make a thorough and exhaustive study of modern nationalism, and to examine ways of fighting its manifestations in the revolutionary movement.

CHAPTER II

METHODS OF STUDYING MODERN NATIONALISM

Let us take the three key aspects of modern nationalism—the social, theoretical and political. To begin with, nationalism is fairly widespread, and frequently an important ingredient of mass movements. Secondly, it is a formidable theoretical problem, with its many students taking different philosophical positions and offering numerous, sometimes conflicting, solutions. Thirdly, the classes in modern society, the political parties and their leaders, find it necessary to define their attitude towards, and politically assess, this complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Frequently, their attitudes to nationalism are built on contrasts, and their assessments are mutually exclusive.

These three aspects tend to influence each other. The complexity of nationalism is not always adequately reflected in academic and social-political thought. Thought is influenced by the political assessment, whether positive or negative. Conversely, the concepts of nationalism suggested by its many students influence the political assessment.

Marxist researchers and the Communist parties treat the problem of nationalism with the thoroughness and depth it deserves. In the Central Committee Report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, L. I. Brezhnev said that together with other governing Communist parties, the CPSU has continued the elaboration of the fundamental questions of the develop-

ment of the world socialist system¹ and named struggle against nationalism as one such fundamental problem. The 24th Congress considers that the struggle against anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, and also against Right- and "Left"-wing revisionism, and nationalism, continues to be an important and pressing task.²

Like any other social phenomenon, nationalism is not immutable. It alters its forms, its place and role in the life of society. New elements appear in its content. Its links with other social phenomena change. And this poses new questions. In our time, for example, with the danger of nationalism so much greater for the world revolutionary process, special importance attaches to the method of approach to such questions as the relation of the class element to the national element, and of the international to the national, the interrelation of the national and nationalist, and the real historical place, social role, essence and content of the different manifestations of nationalism.

The Marxist-Leninist Approach to Nationalism

The methodological difficulties of studying nationalism may be traced to its complexity and peculiarity as a social phenomenon. First of all, it is directly connected with the relationship between social-ethnic communities, and with class relationships, with the revolutionary movement in general, and the national liberation movement in particular.

Secondly, nationalism does not exist in a pure form, is always closely associated with political, juridical, religious and other social views, is actually their ingredient.

Thirdly, it tends to change its specific historical content and assumes many different forms.

Bourgeois scholars, too, admit the extraordinary complexity of nationalism as a phenomenon in history, and also

¹ 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1971, p. 123.

² Ibid., p. 216.

the difficulties of studying it.¹ Often, they use this as a pretext for absolving themselves of guilt for the infertility of their constructions.

An analysis of nationalism cannot be fruitful, unless based on the Marxist dialectical method, its principles of objectiveness and comprehensiveness, concrete historical approach, and definition of the most essential connections.

We can benefit from the existing models of the materialist dialectical approach and the fundamental principles of solving national problems and combating nationalism. The materialist conception of history pioneered by Marx enabled him to determine the real material premises for human communities, the dialectics of their interrelationship and historical development. "The relations of different nations among themselves depend upon the extent to which each has developed its productive forces, the division of labour and internal intercourse. . . . But not only the relation of one nation to others, but also the whole internal structure of the nation itself depends on the stage of development reached by its production and its internal and external intercourse."²

Marx and Engels discovered the interconnection between the class, national, and international elements in the movement of society and worked out the basic principles for solving the national question. Lenin developed and enriched these principles to fit the specific further development of nations, their internal relations and relations between nationalities, and also the national liberation movements of the 20th century.

He used the concrete historical approach as the essential principle in analysing the state and outlook of national relationships, and the content and place of nationalism in the revolutionary process. In his "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", Lenin wrote that "the categorical

¹ See K. Symmons-Symonolewicz, *Modern Nationalism: Toward a Consensus in Theory*, New York, 1968, p. 11.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1964, p. 32.

requirement of Marxist theory in investigating any social question is that it be examined within *definite* historical limits, and, if it refers to a particular country (e.g., the national programme for a given country), that account be taken of the specific features distinguishing that country from others in the same historical epoch".¹

Within the framework of these fundamental Marxist principles, we must also employ methods suiting the specific quality of nationalism. In examining nationalism on a purely historical plane, for example, one may confine oneself to an elementary, chronological, purely empirical description of nationalist phenomena. But this will not show its essence. A description and classification of nationalism on a purely geographical plane—by continents, zones and countries—would also be insufficient, for it withholds from the student the resemblances and disparities of nationalist trends rooted in a definite class basis.

To see the nature and peculiarities of nationalism, in particular its multiple connections with other social phenomena, we must make a close study of its components, their interrelationship and mutation. The dialectical method presupposes singling out a definite number of basic aspects and qualities from the aggregate of social relations. Study of the intrinsic components of nationalism then enables us to determine its real place and role in the life of society, and to trace its origin, stages of development and future prospects.

Society can be analysed in various contexts, based on different types of social relations. The economic identity of people and their social-economic relations, for example, may be the basis for analysing society's economic organisation. Accordingly, class, professional, religious and other social identities, and the relations arising on their basis, are the point of departure for analysing other aspects of the organisation of society.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 400-01.

In this sense, the objective existence of social-ethnic communities and the national-ethnic (national) relations arising on their basis enable us to analyse society from the standpoint of its national problems. Study of all the national relations and problems enables us to probe more deeply into nationalism.

Study of the dialectical interaction of different types of social organisations presents a serious problem in choice of method. Each type of social organisation plays a different role. The determining role in a class society belongs to class relations. But the relationship of different types of social organisations changes continuously in the process of history. It is safe to say, therefore, that the aggregate of national relations is up to a definite point relatively independent, this independence being expressed through the historical continuity of this or that aspect of life during the passage from one form of social-ethnic community to the next. National relations often retain traces of the remote material and social factors and causes from which they had originated.

Continuity is also evident in the reflection of the aggregate national relations at the level of ordinary and theoretical consciousness. Not only do many aspects of national relations remain embedded in the social consciousness, but also materialise in practice. This is seen clearly during acutely critical situations, such as wars, the objective results of which have a direct bearing on national relations, national contradictions and national interests.

Though emphasising the continuity and dynamics of national relations, and also their effect on other aspects of public life, we should be wrong if we concluded that national relations hold a determining place in society. On the contrary, studying the aggregate national relations and related manifestations of nationalism, we are required to follow the Marxist class approach.

The Marxist theory of social development has determined and thoroughly substantiated the fact that in a class society the relationship of classes, the class factor, plays the determining role and makes an ineradicable imprint on all the

other aspects of the organisation of society, including national relations.

Bourgeois sociologists regard the nation as the social group determining the consciousness of the individual. They go on to aver the necessity of "national unity". Referring to these bourgeois distortions, Lenin wrote: "The development of nationality in general is the principle of bourgeois nationalism. . . ."¹

The point was also dealt with in the Leninist spirit by S. Shaumyan, an eminent figure of the CPSU. He said that "the basic principle of nationalism is that nationality equals individuality which must be sustained and developed in every way and at any price, and that nationality is the *natural* and *eternal* form of socio-political being, that nationality must conduct its social affairs as a single whole".

The Marxist analysis of the social place and consciousness of individuals concentrates first of all on their class background, because they have "their position in life and their personal development assigned to them by their class, become subsumed under it".² Lenin said: "...No living person *can help taking the side* of one class or another (once he has understood their inter-relationships), can help rejoicing at the successes of that class and being disappointed by its failures, can help being angered by those who are hostile to that class, who hamper its development by disseminating backward views, and so on and so forth."³

At the same time, according to Marx, the individual is always the essence of all social formations, which are also that individual's real universality, and hence the *common patrimony* of all people.⁴ It follows that a person's identification with a national-ethnic community (social formation)

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 35.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 69.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 531.

⁴ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1975, pp. 39-40.

exercises a definite and important influence on his or her consciousness, behaviour and actions.

The liberal bourgeois approach to national relations makes an absolute of the national identity and negates the class factor, whereas the ultra-left approach negates the role of national relations, reducing everything to the class factor alone. This sort of vulgar sociology often leads to an ultra-nationalist perception of reality.

But to overcome the one-sidedness of these approaches, one must understand the interconnection between the universally human, class and national elements in the process of history. The dialectical connection between these elements follows from the fact that the nation is a historical entity. It encompasses and penetrates all social formations, including classes, and is in a certain sense a spatial framework for class relations and contradictions.

Also, the nation represents the continuity of the material and spiritual cultures, as well as social and everyday forms of communication in the history of definite peoples. Thus, the universally human and class-historical always appear in national garb, the significance and influence of which we should never overlook in analysing the development of a society.

Apart from defining the initial principles of research consonant with the nature and peculiarities of nationalism, there is another difficulty: nationalism as a social phenomenon has been studied insufficiently. Frequently, too, the more general categories related to nationalism mean different things to different people.

**The System
of Conceptions
Necessary
for Analysing
Nationalism**

There is a scientific and political need for precise definitions reflecting national relations and nationalism—a set of conceptions relating to social-ethnic community, national relations, national liberation movement, nationalism and internationalism.

For many years, a discussion continued concerning the problem of nations in the Moscow journal *Voprosy istorii* (Problems of History). Some scholars examined the concept

of the historical movement of social-ethnic communities—a fruitful concept because it enables us to study national relations in the historical evolution of different social-ethnic communities.

Any form of community is social in nature. The historical forms of an ethnic community are no exception. Furthermore, the correlation of social nature and ethnic form changes with the succession of social-economic formations and the character of ethnic connections. Dialectical continuity is a feature of the social nature of human community, determined in the final analysis by the development of the productive forces. However, there is no historically direct continuity between clan and nation. The higher forms of social-ethnic community evolve mainly as an aggregate of different anteceding social-ethnic communities. Despite the absence of a direct continuity, the ethnic (national) form is relatively independent, retaining elements of the remote past.

Seen from this angle, the widespread view that only a fully evolved community, such as nation or nationality, has a national complexion, appears to be deficient. The nation is the most mature, and in this sense the highest and historically last, social-ethnic community. But to understand its social place and historical role, we must study its connection with the preceding social-ethnic communities. This is extremely important if we want to understand the historical origins and manifestations of nationalism.

The available Marxist literature contains different points of view on the content of various categories relating to nation, nationality, national relations, the national liberation movement, and nationalism. Some fail to differentiate sufficiently between the national and nationalist. But is it correct to regard the entire content of the ideology of the national bourgeoisie as bourgeois nationalism? Or should nationalism be treated as merely a part of the political, juridical and religious ideology of the national bourgeoisie?

Obviously, we must distinguish between, and define, the content of “national” and “nationalist”, which are the two broadest categories.

The initial premise in the concept "national" is that the nation is the highest and historically last social-ethnic community. In the final analysis, it represents the material and spiritual uniqueness that evolved through the preceding social-ethnic communities. In a broader sense, "national" applies not only to nations, but also to nationalities and tribal communities.

Naturally, "national" is applicable in this broad sense only if we remember its concrete historical content, which depends on the social character of the relationship of classes and the specific features and degree of maturity of the social-ethnic community. Making a concrete analysis of "national", we should bear in mind that in antagonistic formations the social-ethnic communities are rent by class contradictions.

The polarisation and antagonism of the classes (the main content of the social aspect) predominate over the national element and breed antagonisms between, as well as inside, nations. Yet the national community does not disappear; it only assumes specific features consonant with its social nature. In the final analysis, the evolution of the national is determined by the class standing in the centre of the historical epoch, for that is the class which transforms the objective results of the activity of the members of the social-ethnic community.

In trying to finalise the content of the categories reflecting national relations and nationalism, and suggesting a system of such categories, we followed the principles of historical materialism as the general sociological theory of the progress of society. In particular, historical materialism has settled the questions of the level and structure of social consciousness, and of the interrelationship of elements of consciousness, which characterise it as a definite system.

The essence of the Marxist method is concrete analysis of all phenomena, and of their reflection in the consciousness. The Marxist method does not superimpose abstract or mental patterns on reality. It is therefore the only reliable method for working out a system of categories reflecting the specific content of all the peculiar aspects of national relations.

This has been the basis for the suggested formulations of the content of the national, though, of course, we would not presume to claim that our definitions are final and conclusive. We have only endeavoured to emphasise the specific content of the national, international, and nationalist. And more even than this we tried to draw a clear line between the national and nationalist. In so doing, we bore in mind that the full development of the national is not possible until after the socialist revolution eliminates class polarisation and class antagonisms. Both the specific and universal features of the national, as they evolved in the preceding socio-economic formations, stand out clearly in the process.

Firstly, as a historical phenomenon the *national* may be described as the result of the material and spiritual activity (coupled with extraneous influences and their results) of a number of generations of a social-ethnic community, comprising a sum-total of material, technical, cultural and spiritual values, interests and relations. This sum-total takes shape in the historical development of the social-ethnic community.

Logically speaking, the difficulty of defining the content of the national stems from its being a relative category. A conclusive definition is conceivable only if "national" is associated with "international". If the two are treated metaphysically and are dissociated, the interpretations of national and international phenomena are bound to prove incorrect: suffice it to recall the claim that Marxism is European in character, while Leninism is specifically Russian.¹

Secondly, the national is part of the international, amounting to the positive contribution that a social-ethnic community makes to the world historical process, its response to the problems arising during the general course of world history, and also the progressive values of the material and spiritual culture of the world this community has absorbed or adopted.

¹ Franz Marek, *Was Lenin wirklich sagte*, Wien, 1969.

Seen from this angle, a truly scientific theory is necessarily international. Originating in some definite country as the result of the theoretical activity of the members of a nation, and possessing a clearly pronounced national identity, it is still first and foremost a reflection of the requirements and objective tendencies of world history. In this sense, neither Marxism nor Leninism is specifically German or Russian. The integrity and world-wide relevance of Marxism-Leninism stems from the fact that it is a many-sided scientific theory showing the objective laws governing the development of all humanity.

In a class society the national is always the historical result of the complex dialectics of the class struggle, in the course of which each of the participants exercises a specific influence on the material and spiritual culture. This is precisely what Lenin meant when referring to the existence of two cultures in the developed nations of capitalist society.

The less general, though still highly important, aspects of the national may be expressed by the concepts "national interest", "national feelings", "national psychology", "national self-awareness", "national ideology" and "national policy". Scholars must define their content, for all of them reflect essential aspects of the national. We, too, shall suggest a number of definitions.

Why it is necessary to look into these concepts is that latter-day Marxist literature contains somewhat differing interpretations. One of the papers presented at the Conference on the Theoretical Questions of Socialist Internationalism, for example, suggested that the concept "national feelings" includes national sympathy and antipathy, feelings of respect and of contempt, trust and suspicion, love and hate. To our mind, this confuses the national with the nationalist, whereas the two must be strictly separated.

As we see it, the conception of national as a sum-total of material, cultural and spiritual values, interests and relations arising during the historical development of a definite social-ethnic community in harmony with the inter-

national and with the national of other social-ethnic communities, will help to distinguish phenomena relating to the national from those relating to the nationalist.

National sympathy and respect for other peoples do not conflict with the truly national; more, they may be regarded as part of the national. But antipathy for members of another people, contempt, mistrust, suspicion, or hatred, are distinctly part of the nationalist. And this separation of the national from the nationalist is not just an academic question; it is also a most important and sharp political question.

In distinguishing between the national and nationalist, we should proceed from their material source—the socio-economic requirements. In a class society the socio-economic requirements of the exploiters and the exploited are poles apart, and the national form is frequently used by the ruling classes (pleading for “national unity”) to assure suppression of the exploited.

Already at the stage before a nation takes full shape (the stage of nationality) such of its attributes as territory (guaranteed by some form of statehood) and a certain degree of economic identity, begin to gain importance. Their economic and territorial bonds consolidate the members of a people and despite class distinctions produce a definite community of material and spiritual requirements, the sum-total of which comprises the concept “national interest”.

National interest is a specific aggregate of the stable material and spiritual requirements of a social-ethnic community, ultimately determined by economic necessity and the need for progressive development. In principle, the genuine national interest of a community does not conflict with the national interest of other social-ethnic communities. Admittedly, premises for harmony between the internal and external national interest of different social-ethnic communities appear only after class antagonisms are eliminated and the national question is thoroughly resolved on a basis of justice.

Analysing the category “national interest”, we should bear in mind the complex dialectics of the class and national

elements, and the primacy of the class element. In bourgeois theories the term "national interest" is often used to cover up class contradictions. Frequently, the interest of the ruling class is portrayed as that of the whole nation. This necessitates a study of the correlation between the aspirations of the ruling class and the tendency of social progress, including the development of the social-ethnic community.

The problem of national interest is highly significant, because the intrinsic contradictions of the capitalist system, and those between capitalism and socialism on a world scale, are growing sharper. History shows that in the extraordinary conditions created by imperialism and the forces of counter-revolution, defence of the national interest is the class duty of the socialist states—an act of fidelity to socialist internationalism and of concern for the future of socialism and peace. As stressed in the Central Committee Report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, "the peoples of the socialist countries have clearly demonstrated to the whole world that they will not give up their revolutionary gains, and that the borders of the socialist community are immutable and inviolable".

In the socialist community, the national interest of each of its member-countries should at all stages of maturity and unity first of all take into account the internationalist responsibility of Communists for the future of world socialism and the world revolutionary movement.

The territorial and economic relations arising in a social-ethnic community are reflected in the national consciousness along with the national interest. The shaping of the different levels of a society's national consciousness—national feelings, national psychology, national consciousness and self-awareness, and national ideology—fully reflects the development of a social-ethnic community.

The social consciousness as a whole, and each of its levels, reflect the sum-total of the widely different communities, such as the familial, professional, religious, class, national, etc. And just as in the life of a society so in the

social consciousness each of these communities and their reflection are closely interconnected.

In a class society, therefore, there is no such thing as purely national feelings or psychology or consciousness, and least of all a purely national ideology. At the higher levels of social consciousness, the class element is, as a rule, distinctly the determining one. Only in a theoretical investigation can we dissociate ourselves—and this only temporarily—from the complex interlacement of elements in order to accentuate the logical content of categories reflecting the various aspects of the national.

National feelings are the aggregate of sentiments and feelings of affection for a social-ethnic community, for the peculiar natural environment in which it develops, of respect for its positive traditions and culture, of affinity with its historical destiny, and solidarity with other members of the same social-ethnic community. Genuine national feelings imply respect for similar national feelings of other peoples and for the superior material and spiritual values of world culture.

The Second World War and the disintegration of the imperialist colonial system stimulated a rapid growth of national feelings, which played so great a part in rallying the progressive anti-fascist and anti-imperialist forces. As a rule, in fact, national feelings become keener in critical social situations, and especially when the existence of a social-ethnic community is placed in jeopardy.

National feelings are a component of the *national psychology*. National psychology is a stable and as a rule spontaneously evolving aggregate of feelings, notions, sentiments or desires reflecting the positive content of traditions, customs and mores, and of the joint activity of a social-ethnic community. A component of the general consciousness, national psychology is closely linked with national ideology.

National self-awareness is chiefly a sense of affinity with a definite social-ethnic community, and awareness of one's relation to the material and spiritual requirements of its

progressive development. It depends on the historical level of the community and its individuals. The origin and functioning of national self-awareness require special study and have of late been attracting the attention of Marxist scholars, particularly in connection with the problems of national ideology and national consciousness.

The concepts "national feeling", "national psychology" and "national self-awareness" are typical of such levels of social consciousness which reflect various aspects of the national without yet a theoretical conceptualisation of national problems. The leading element at these levels of consciousness is an emotional, rather than conceptual, reflection of reality. The emotional relation to one's own and to other social-ethnic communities predominates.

It is only at the level of ideology in both the social consciousness as a whole and in that part of it which reflects problems related to the development of the national that there arise theoretically arranged views on national problems. By *national ideology*, therefore, we mean the complete set of views reflecting as theories and concepts the community's historical level of development, its national interests, and values. It is particularly important to stress the correlation of national ideology to the ideology of the various classes. In a class society national ideology cannot exist in a pure and permanent form. It takes shape as part of the social consciousness:

— firstly, during the historical emergence of a nationality and nation in the epoch when general national problems come to the forefront and their reflection becomes a necessary component of the ideology of classes and social groups standing at the head of the social movement (the rising bourgeoisie, the modern revolutionary democrats);

— secondly, during acutely critical social and political situations when the existence and future of the social-ethnic community is imperilled and the struggle of the labouring masses for the genuine national interests is at its sharpest. During the anti-fascist and also national liberation struggles, the elements of national ideology expressing the vital in-

terests of the labouring masses and of the social-ethnic community occupy an important place in the social consciousness;

— thirdly, as a result of the socialist revolution and the elimination of class antagonisms, when socialist nations emerge and flourish. Here the dominant socialist ideology is a dialectical unity of the national and the international.

Our analysis so far has yielded several categories reflecting different aspects of the national in the social consciousness. National feelings, national psychology, national self-awareness and national ideology are not isolated from each other and are, in fact, components of one of the forms of social consciousness—national consciousness which is objectively an over-all reflection of the development of an existing social-ethnic community (nation). It reflects all the conflicting elements of the life of the society, and primarily the real national interests, in the consciousness of the members of a definite social-ethnic community. Structurally, national consciousness encompasses national feelings, national psychology, national self-awareness, and national ideology.

Like each of its elements the national consciousness bears the imprint of the class contradictions, the class conception of national interests and problems.

A definite aspect of the national—that related to the interaction of classes, states and social-ethnic communities—is expressed in *national policy*. Unlike nationalist policy this represents the social activity of classes, parties and states assuring the progressive development and the material and spiritual requirements of the social-ethnic community. Real national policy is based on real national interest and is not detrimental to the national and international interest of other communities.

The content of categories expressing different aspects of the national is historical and therefore changeable. It depends on the degree of development of the national, on the specific influence of the social structure, the activity of the class that changes national relations, and the like. All

the same, these categories are ideological forms which more or less adequately reflect, albeit within historically limited frameworks, the real national relations, problems and interests. It does not follow, however, that categories reflecting different aspects of the national lose any of their class content. In a class society, the national must necessarily pass through the prism of class interest.

Due to the class struggle the development of the national follows two lines. One expresses the interests of the labouring masses. The other is connected with the interests of the ruling class, and will coincide with the general direction of social progress only within those concrete historical frameworks in which the ruling class performs a historically progressive social role.

The category "national" is polar in relation to the category "nationalist", which is a false, one-sided and egoistical reflection of the national.

The *nationalist* is an exaggeration and distortion of the national impelled by egoistic class aims; it conceals the class element behind a spuriously construed national element, and counterposes national interests and values to international interests and values, and to the national interests and values of other communities.

Nationalist feelings, psychology, egoism, consciousness, ideology, and policy are polar in relation to *national* feelings, psychology, interest, consciousness, ideology and policy.

Examining these categories, we shall notice that in their case the mechanics of class relations and interests operates differently. Their content, expressive of the different aspects of the nationalist, consists of mainly distorted national elements which, as a rule, obstruct social progress. Take the most important ones.

Nationalist psychology is an aggregate of feelings, sentiments, prejudices and dispositions directed against other social-ethnic communities and their members, usually artificially cultivated by the exploiting class or reactionary social groups. *Nationalist consciousness* is a one-sided and distorted reflection of the material and spiritual values and interests

of the social-ethnic community and of the perspectives of its development, encompassing nationalist psychology and ideology. *Nationalist ideology* is a system of egoistic class-oriented views averring everlasting national strife, suspicion and hostility between social-ethnic communities; it opposes the interests of one social-ethnic community to those of other communities.

These definitions are intended to focus the attention of scholars on elaborating a strict system of scientific conceptions, which we require to analyse the entire set of problems connected with national relations, and especially nationalism. Elsewhere in the book we shall endeavour to introduce other categories reflecting aspects of the nationalist.

The above definitions chiefly concern nationalism as an objectively existing social phenomenon. But it also has political implications. And due to the prominence of nationalism in society, every class and social group, and their political parties and organisations, are compelled to make their attitude clear.

This is a political problem, and to resolve it we require a system of scientific and clearly defined categories. Marxist social scientists have worked on the subject for years, and have produced scientific categories relating to intra-national and inter-national relations, one of the most important of these being the category "national question".

Marx, Engels and Lenin have analysed this concept in many of their works. The CPSU and other Communist parties have also examined it in detail. But the continuously developing intra- and inter-national relations, the changing social importance of national problems, necessitate analysis of its changing content.

Scholars may treat the concept "national question" in either a narrow or a broad sense. Some of them interpret it as the whole intricate complex of national relationships.

In this broad sense, attention is focussed chiefly on the importance of relations between different social-ethnic communities in all the formations that have ever existed. But the most important aspect of the national question in an-

tagonistic class societies—that of eliminating national oppression and the ways of achieving true national equality—is left out of the reckoning.

The definition that lays the main accent on the class and political aspects of the national question, widespread in Marxist literature, seems to be more acceptable and accurate. For it conceives the national question as one of eliminating national oppression and inequality. Naturally, this interpretation has strict historical boundaries. It applies chiefly to the conditions that exist under capitalism, where national oppression and inequality are deliberate, attaining the greatest sharpness during the imperialist epoch with its international system of colonial slavery. In the course of socialist reconstruction the national question is ultimately solved.

The fairly clear historical limits of the emergence and solution of the national question necessitate a scientific vocabulary that would reflect both the relations between national (social-ethnic) communities which took shape before the national question arose, and national relationships that continue to exist after that question is solved.

To stress the socio-political significance of the national, it seems desirable—as in the case of the class element influencing all class relations—to introduce the category “national element of the social structure”.

We need this category, broader than the category “national question”, chiefly for our revolutionary practice. For in the Soviet Union and many other socialist countries the national question in the proper sense of the word, as a political class issue, has been fully resolved. The existing complex of national relations within and between the socialist countries can no longer be properly covered by the concept “national question”. The present state of relations between and within different peoples in the USSR and in some other socialist states is so unique that it cannot be reduced to just a national question.

The national (social-ethnic) element of the social structure is the aggregate of internal and external relationships, pro-

cesses and problems arising in the history of a social-ethnic community, the evolution of its national interests, values, conditions of life, etc. The content of the category "national element" is very broad.

The difficulty of defining the national element is due, first, to the fluidity of its content, which changes continually in the process of social development as a result of changing class relations, class movements, the changing intensity of the class struggle, and to the development of the nation or nationality and its changing ties with other social-ethnic communities. This is why the content of the national element differs in different periods of history.

Further, the national element does not exist independently, in a pure form. It is linked with different aspects of life, is part of the economic, political, ideological, and other relations. Like all general conceptions, it is a scientific abstraction reflecting the totality of the existing national, i.e., the national side of social relations.

The national element includes the relation of a social-ethnic community to other communities and the problems arising in this relationship. The relationship may be friendly, in which case the national life of the social-ethnic communities is mutually enriched. But it may be a relation of domination and subordination, hostility and suspicion, which also leaves an imprint on national life.

The national element in the life of a society also includes the relation of individuals and social groups to the interests, values and problems of their own and other ethnic communities. All members of a social-ethnic community have a stake in equality with other nations and nationalities, in the perspective of the national economy, the national language, tradition and customs, spiritual life, etc.

In a class society the decisive role belongs to the class element, the aggregate of links and relations between classes, the objective laws governing the class struggle. All other aspects of life, including the national element, are subordinate to the class element. But the national element, too, affects the class element. So long as social-ethnic communities exist,

many social processes unfold within nations, nationalities and ethnic groups, and are thus nationally coloured. For example, it is customary to speak of the distinctive national traditions of the class struggle of French, German, Russian and other workers.

The class element, the leading element in the social structure of a class society, is the content, while the national element, subordinate but still important, is a historically peculiar form conditioned by the existence of, and the important part played by, ethnic communities in the social processes. But the national element is not only a historically peculiar form assumed by social processes; it is their natural historical limit.

Summing up, we may point to three important aspects of the national element. First, it encompasses the aggregate of relations between social-ethnic communities. Second, it encompasses internal relations connected with the life and historical outlook of the social-ethnic community concerned. Third, the national element influences other social processes and the relations between the national (social-ethnic) and other aspects of social life, first of all the class element.

The national element, which represents the historically evolved features of the relation between social-ethnic communities, is relatively independent. This is why at each historical stage it includes not only the national problems, but also some of the results of the preceding forms of social-ethnic intercourse prevailing in the social psychology and in some of the national habits, customs, traditions, and the like.

At the lowest level of the productive forces, in the primeval society, relations between social-ethnic communities, which were still in their infancy, and also within them, were not in principle socially irreconcilable. The development of the substantial disparities between social-ethnic communities, and within them, into contradictions and finally into antagonisms, their development into conflicts, is conditioned by the appearance of the surplus product, private property, class differentiation, and class antagonisms. Social

differentiation and class antagonisms change the relationship between all the composite elements of a society. The class element becomes determinative, for the main social content of the historical process is concentrated in it, and the class struggle becomes the motive force of the development of society.

In this situation, with class relations becoming the main content of social development, the place and role of the national element changes. It withdraws to the background and becomes a peculiar national form of social movement and, up to a point, a natural limit circumscribed by the social-ethnic community in which the class struggle occurs. It gains new aspects due to the emergence of more stable social-ethnic communities—nationalities and later nations—and also other conflicting tendencies.

Ethnocentrism, which originates with the formation of ethnic groups and social-ethnic communities, changes substantially in class societies. In a pre-class society or in a society where the class differentiation is still indistinct, ethnocentrism is chiefly a simple distinction between one and another ethnic community, and expresses the affinity of individuals to these communities. But in an antagonistic class society a new phenomenon appears. The simple distinction between social-ethnic communities and the affinity with one of them are supplemented by opposition, even hostility, to other ethnic communities. In the final analysis, this corresponds to the interests of the exploiters.

This phenomenon may be traced to the fact that under the impact of the class element the real disparities between national interests degenerate into national antagonisms. Genuine national interests are supplanted by the interests of the exploiting class, whose economic and political-ideological pressure generates hostility towards members of other social-ethnic communities, towards their national interests, thus acting as a source of the nationalist.

These new aspects of ethnocentrism arising in class societies are the key to the historical sources of the nationalist and of nationalism. The distinction between one's own

social-ethnic community and another gives rise to the national, whereas opposing one's own ethnic community to others generates the nationalist. The category "nationalism" includes a number of related social phenomena based on the degeneration and replacement of the genuinely national with egoistic class interests and aims.

It should be noted that by itself the historical development of social-ethnic communities, the formation of national relations, national interests and the national consciousness, do not breed the nationalist and nationalism. They only form the basis that allows for the distortion of the national and its growth into the nationalist. The decisive role in this is played by the class element, by class antagonisms. In the class struggle nationalism as a social phenomenon and socio-political problem changes its content and forms.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL VARIETIES OF NATIONALISM

Although historically nations first take shape on the basis of capitalist relations of production, the national (social-ethnic) element, and its social role, were in evidence before classes ever appeared.

The Preconditions for Nationalism

It will be recalled that blood ties were among the earliest natural elements in the organisation of human society. Their role kept changing in step with the development of material production. Yet the socio-economic process unfolded within definite social-ethnic communities, which were relatively stable units based on common ethnic origin, language, culture, territory and economy.

The most typical for the primeval communal system were such social-ethnic communities as gentes, tribes and tribal alliances. The aggregate of social-ethnic relations within and between communities, as we have already said, comprises the historical content of the national (social-ethnic) element in the pre-class society.

In the primeval organisation of society social-ethnic communities occupy a most important place, for there is no class division of people, while the professional and social division of labour is still only embryonic. And we should bear in mind that up to a certain point social-ethnic communities play a similar role in the life of those present-day peoples in which the classes are still only scantily differentiated.

In the pre-class society, too, the social role of the national element was doubtlessly contradictory. On the one hand, the development of social-ethnic communities reflected the degree of maturity (of the society) and, accordingly, the historical progress of mankind. On the other, there appeared the primary forms of segregation, which, given definite conditions, led to conflicting relations between primeval communities. Here are the sources of mistrust of members of other social-ethnic communities. Later, in the class society, the seed blossoms, resulting in a nationalist psychology consolidated by the way of life, the impact of traditions, and the political class situation.

The reactionary content of the relations between different social-ethnic communities appeared first in the antagonistic class society based on slavery.

Nationalities—which are linguistic, territorial, economic and cultural social-ethnic communities preceding the emergence of nations—take shape in the slave and feudal societies. The formation of a nationality is a complicated process powered by the action and influence of many different factors: the emergence of tribal alliances implying closer inter-tribal economic and cultural ties; military collisions between different tribes; migrations; the appearance of private property and the differentiation of classes. The last two factors are basic, leading to a gradual mixing of tribes, with blood ties gradually ceasing to play an organising role.

The appearance of the state in the class society exercises a strong influence on the formation of nationalities. It tends to consolidate the nationalities, since their further development occurs within definite state limits. Various economic and political integrational processes influenced the formation of nationalities in the slave society. Broad economic and political communities arose in the shape of alliances, city states, federations, monarchies and empires.

All these contradictory and frequently conflicting aspects in the development of social-ethnic communities affected the psychology of the people, and the ideology and policy of

the slave states. There were two basic tendencies in the pre-capitalist epoch, which in due course became part of the content of nationalism as a social phenomenon.

The *first tendency* is related to the ideological vindication of the privileged status arrogated by the dominant nationality. Ideological and political conceptions of "chosen" and "inferior" peoples became widespread, justifying the "chosen" nationalities' claim to the leading role and the subordinate status of the "inferior" nationality. In Ancient Greece, for example, there was the distinction between Hellene and barbarian, and in Ancient Rome between Roman and barbarian. Other nationalities, all described as barbarians, were regarded as the real or potential object of exploitation by the "chosen".

The *second tendency* is related to the appearance of the urge for self-preservation among tribes and nationalities subjected to conquest and exploitation. It was a contradictory urge. On the one hand, political and economic self-isolation, and the negative attitude to the experience of other nationalities, acted as a brake on social development. On the other, however, the urge for self-preservation resulted from resistance to subordination by the dominant nationality. These conflicting effects became lasting traditions in evidence throughout the succeeding epochs.

Figuratively, these complex processes may be regarded as the pre-history of modern nationalism when definite premises and some of its components were taking shape. But why are they the pre-history of nationalism? The definition of nationalism as an over-exaggeration of the national element for egoistic class purposes would allow us to refer them directly to nationalism.

In general terms the answer is this: apparently, the national element and its class content must pass definite historical stages of development, attaining a definite degree of maturity before it can be inflated, exaggerated and distorted for egoistic class purposes.

Historians, ethnographers, philosophers and various other scholars must pool their efforts to investigate the develop-

ment of social-ethnic communities. At the present time we can only voice a few ideas on why the national element could not for so long a time serve as the basis for the inception of nationalism.

In primitive society the relationship between different social-ethnic communities was neither stable nor systematic.

In slave society and feudalism subsistence farming dominated economic life and tended to limit the growth of the external and internal intercourse of the existing social-ethnic communities.

The alienation and hostility between members of different social-ethnic communities in the slave societies and in early feudalism is not really nationalism. Yet definite conditions are at hand for absolutising the interests of the social-ethnic community for egoistic class purposes. Their evolution, however, is a long and complicated process. Objectively, it is based on the development and interaction of the national and class elements of the social structure. Each of these must pass through a definite historical evolution before nationalism becomes a social phenomenon. The analysis of nationalism is also complicated by the fact that its components make their appearance at different times in history and change their class content.

Among these is a changed, distinctly class-oriented ethnocentrism. The relations of domination and subordination that appear in the slave society spread to the social-ethnic communities, as in the case of the ancient Greeks, Romans, Persians and Aryans, on the one hand, and their subject peoples, on the other. The differences between the social-ethnic communities acquire an antagonistic class character. The emergence of the state and the exploiting politico-ideological superstructure becomes an important element in the manipulation of the consciousness of the oppressed masses. The exploiting classes cultivate nationalistic notions, which enable them to portray their class aims as the interest of the social-ethnic community. This is how the ideological element of nationalism arises in the pre-capitalist class formations as a component of the as yet undifferentiated

exploiting superstructure, and also as a psychological factor as the result of its impregnation in the mass consciousness.

With the growth of capitalist relations in the womb of feudalism there begins a break-up of the internal barriers founded on the prevalence of subsistence farming. Intricate transformations occur in the social-ethnic communities—most rapidly during the emergence of capitalism, at the time of bourgeois revolutions. However, in the preceding periods, too, there were processes that later led to the development of nationalities into nations. In his "Decay of Feudalism and Emergence of Nation-States", Frederick Engels dates the source of changes within social-ethnic communities in Western Europe to the 9th and 10th centuries.¹

Deep changes occur in the class content of the relations between and within social-ethnic communities during the emergence of capitalism, with the national element attaining a new stage of maturity. And on becoming more complex, influenced by the class element it begins to be the basis for various historical varieties of nationalism.

What do we mean by historical varieties of nationalism? If nationalism is examined on the historical plane, we shall distinguish the peculiarities of its concrete historical content and its various forms.

As a social phenomenon, nationalism may be ascribed to definite causes, which, like any other phenomenon, represent a dialectics of the general, particular and singular. Using this method, we can break them down into three groups—general, particular and singular—whose intricate combination lies behind the multiplicity of nationalism.

Distortion and inflation of the national element, exaggeration of its role in society, are typical of nationalism and stem from its general causes. The national element is wrenched out of focus under the influence of the egoistic interests of the exploiting classes and social groups, which take advantage of national problems and relations for their own ends.

¹ K. Marx/F. Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 21, Berlin, 1962, S. 395-96.

The operation of particular causes creates a historical variety of nationalism. The category "historical variety" stands for a definite type of nationalism conditioned by the concrete socio-economic and class content of the socio-economic formation or historical epoch. In other words, the division of nationalism into historical varieties shows what class or social group is behind the distortion of the national element, whose social interests and aims it serves, and what features it possesses.

Due to concrete conditions and reasons, every historical variety of nationalism may assume different forms at different times and in different regions and countries. Its forms derive from a definite correlation of the inner structure of its components. The dominant politico-ideological conception of one of the exploiting classes or social groups is usually the main formative factor.

Pre-Bourgeois Nationalism

Since the bourgeoisie was historically the first directing force behind the formation of nations, many Marxist scholars conceive nationalism merely as the bourgeoisie's ideology and policy in the sphere of national relations. But some Soviet scholars take a different view. They maintain that history has seen three types of nationalism: pre-bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and bourgeois.

In our view the widespread conception of nationalism as a singularly bourgeois phenomenon in essence and genesis, is not confirmed by available historical evidence. The formation of nations begins on the basis of nascent capitalist relations in the womb of feudalism and in the period of its decay. This is why nationalism takes shape before the victory of capitalism, in the epoch of feudal disintegration—especially in the social psychology, and later as a form of ideology and a political action programme.

The contradictory processes in the life of social-ethnic communities impelled by the emergence of capitalist relations, are reflected in the psychology, ideology, politics, and social practice of the ruling class of feudal society. Not only the rising bourgeoisie, but also the feudals used the national

element to fortify their position of dominance and to disguise their egoistic and narrow class interests. It is, therefore, useful to distinguish the pre-bourgeois historical variety of nationalism—an ideological weapon of the ruling exploiting class of feudal society.

In his many works on nationalism, Lenin distinguishes between government-sponsored Black-Hundred, landlord nationalism and bourgeois nationalism. In his "Right of Nations to Self-Determination", he writes: "Carried away by the struggle against nationalism in Poland, Rosa Luxemburg has forgotten the nationalism of the Great Russians, although it is *this* nationalism that is the most formidable at the present time. It is a nationalism that is more feudal than bourgeois, and is the principal obstacle to democracy and to the proletarian struggle."¹

Pre-bourgeois nationalism as a special historical variety requires further study. We must determine its influence on the psychology and ideology of the labouring masses. Its forms, scholars note, have been only superficially explored. At our present level of knowledge we can only point to its principal manifestations. One of these was *ethnic nationalism*, which contraposes different peoples by origin and ethnic peculiarities. Imposed by the exploiting classes, this contraposition succeeded the tendency towards self-preservation which appeared in the old-time world during the emergence of nations. Later, in modern history, elements of ethnic nationalism may be observed in some of the Pan-Germanic, Pan-Slavic and Pan-Turkic conceptions, which exaggerated ethnic peculiarities.

Clerico-feudal nationalism was another form of pre-bourgeois nationalism, which contrasted social-ethnic communities by religious beliefs. Behind the screen of religious identity it disguised the class interests of the feudal lords, and temporarily banded several social-ethnic communities under the same religious banner. Clerico-feudal nationalism was invoked to justify conquests and set one people against

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 412.

another. For example, it provided the ideological justification of the Crusades; the predatory interests of the feudal crusaders were concealed by the concept of liberating the holy places and waging a holy Christian war against the Islamic and Slav peoples.

Feudal-monarchist nationalism, widespread at the time of feudal absolutism, is yet another form of pre-bourgeois nationalism. It opposed peoples inhabiting territories of different feudal states. Its class aim was to justify the new state framework of feudal rule, and to assert new forms of social-ethnic consolidation.

All these forms of pre-bourgeois nationalism reposed objectively on the far-reaching changes that took place in the life of nationalities during the development and consolidation of capitalist relations. Paradoxically, the same objective aspects of the national element in the structure of society were used by the feudals and the bourgeoisie for diametrically opposite class aims. The social meaning of clerico-feudal and feudal-monarchist nationalism was to preserve feudal relations, segregate the developing socio-economic communities, and thereby slow up social progress and block the rise of capitalism. The nationalism of the rising bourgeoisie, on the other hand, as Lenin said, contained relatively progressive democratic elements aimed at destroying the estates and the entire feudal system, which impeded the rise of nations and capitalist relations.

These forms of pre-bourgeois nationalism should not escape our field of vision as we analyse similar processes in the relations between different social-ethnic communities in formerly oppressed and dependent countries that have recently embarked on social liberation.

Bourgeois Nationalism

Bourgeois nationalism, another historical variety of nationalism, surfaced in the capitalist socio-economic formation. It raises the national element to an absolute, perverting it to suit the egoistic class interests of the bourgeoisie.

In its early stages bourgeois nationalism was influenced by various aspects of pre-bourgeois nationalism. Once

capitalism triumphed in the ideological field and bourgeois ideology became dominant in society, bourgeois nationalist ideology, too, began to prevail. And since the antagonistic formations are essentially of one type, the existing forms of pre-bourgeois nationalism underwent an evolution and became subordinate to the nationalist ideology of the dominant bourgeoisie. The pre-bourgeois forms exercise the strongest influence on people in the field known as social psychology.

Bourgeois nationalism proper develops in step with the bourgeoisie's economic and political consolidation in the contention against feudalism. At once, two aspects gain prominence in its content. One reflects the objective historical formation of bourgeois nations,¹ expressing the progressive social features of the rising bourgeoisie, while the other is connected with the use of the national element to disguise and glorify the class interests of the bourgeoisie. As the bourgeoisie gradually sheds its progressive quality, this aspect becomes the main content of bourgeois nationalism.

In the dependent countries aspiring to social emancipation, many nationalist phenomena stem from peculiarities in the formation of nations in new states. However, nationalist tendencies there build up in a different historical epoch and different conditions, and are expressive of the break-up of the colonial system. We cannot identify them, therefore,

¹ In the discussion of the properties of nation in the Soviet journal *Uoprosy istorii* some scholars objected to this term. It is quite true that in bourgeois society nations change quality in the present historical epoch, and that the bourgeoisie is no longer the bearer of national interests and consolidation. More striking still are the changes in the process of the consolidation of nationalities and nations in the liberated colonies and dependent countries, especially those that opt for the non-capitalist way. As we see it, the latest historical processes do not fit into the term "bourgeois nations" or "nations of capitalist society". We shall not go into these terms, because they are irrelevant for our investigation, and shall use the term "bourgeois nation" in the logical sense, as the highest stage of a social-ethnic community in the non-socialist world.

with the "classical" bourgeois nationalism and must class them under a different head.

In the developed capitalist countries there are two major politico-ideological trends of bourgeois nationalism. The predominant one is the nationalism of the ruling big bourgeoisie, and the other is petty-bourgeois nationalism.

Nationalism of the big bourgeoisie. All forms of the nationalism of the big bourgeoisie have definite common features. For one thing, they represent the wish of the ruling bourgeoisie to portray its egoistic class interests as the interests of the whole nation, and disguise the class contradictions in the nation with nationalist conceptions. This nationalism seeks expression not only in home, but also in foreign policy. The nationalist foreign-policy conceptions grow into claims to exclusiveness—the exclusiveness of the nation concerned—and to a special historical mission of guidance relative to other nations and peoples.

The main forms of this nationalism are:

first, great-power chauvinism, an ideological form of vindicating domination of other national communities and groups within the country, and of dependent peoples outside the country;

second, racism, which distinguishes people by their biological, physical and psychological qualities to vindicate internal and external colonialism and neo-colonialism. Characteristically, it raises to an absolute, and exploits, national and racial factors in the interests of the exploiting reactionary oligarchy;

third, a new form of nationalism has made its appearance in the 20th century, that of the imperialist bourgeoisie or its most aggressive sections, known as national-socialism (fascism); it seeks to justify by racist theories the hegemonic aspirations of the ruling bourgeoisie of the dominant nation;

fourth, cosmopolitanism, a unique form of the nationalism of the ruling bourgeoisie; it was revived and gained new content in imperialist conditions. Though on the surface cosmopolitanism looks like the antipode of nationalism, the imperialist bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries

uses it in its social practice to achieve its egoistic interests to the detriment of the genuine national interests of its own and other nations and peoples. It is cosmopolitanism that is invoked to deny other nations, objects of hegemonic ambition, the right to promoting their national interest and preserving their national values. In essence, the cosmopolitanism of the ruling bourgeoisie is a ploy to disguise its nationalist interests.

So, we may regard cosmopolitanism as a specific form of the nationalism of the ruling bourgeoisie, being a reflection distorted in the monopoly interest of the objective tendency towards internationalisation of production and international division of labour. It is opposite to proletarian and socialist internationalism, and the class solidarity of the labouring masses. The cosmopolitan denial of alien national traditions, cultures, and sovereignty stems from the nationalist interests of the big bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries.

Zionism is a specific form of modern bourgeois nationalism, serving the interests of monopoly reaction and of magnates of Jewish origin.

All these forms express the class interest of the ruling big bourgeoisie. "Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism," Lenin wrote, "these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question."¹

Petty-bourgeois nationalism. Despite some differences, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalisms have the same foundation. Both are a class-distorted reflection of the national element in the society of private owners of the means of production. The petty-bourgeois variety is a derivative from bourgeois nationalism reflecting the social positions of both old and new middle strata, petty-bourgeois in their nature, especially the peasants. It should be borne in mind that the concept "middle strata" changes in different historical epochs. The middle strata of the time when bourgeois

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26.

nations were only taking shape, for example, are entirely different from those of the present time. Formerly, they were craftsmen, artisans, small traders, and also encompassed a section of educated and professionally trained people.

Today, in the developed capitalist countries the middle strata comprise small private owners of means and implements of production in town and country, craftsmen and artisans, the commercial petty bourgeoisie, owners of service establishments, and a large section of the bureaucracy, office employees and professionals comprising the non-proletarian section of hired labour. Contiguous with the middle strata are some members of social groups unstable in composition and social role (such as students and the studying youth in general).

Owing to their dual social status, the middle strata, petty-bourgeois in life style, activity and world outlook, display a contradictory attitude to the national element and national question, with a relatively wide range of political and ideological postures.

The middle strata, especially the petty bourgeoisie, are receptive to the idea of national identity, and often hope to overcome the instability and duality of their social being by advocating national interest. On the other hand, however, the petty bourgeoisie is often vulnerable to nationalist hysteria and serves as a conductor, or nutritive soil, for the nationalism of the ruling bourgeoisie.

This uncertainty stems from the dual psychology of the petty bourgeoisie, whose property narrows the class outlook and makes it gravitate towards national egoism and exclusiveness. In a certain sense, in fact, the petty bourgeoisie is more distinctly nationalist than the ruling bourgeoisie, which is exposed to the influences of integrational processes in the economy and politics. Typically, the petty bourgeoisie has a narrow concept of patriotism, which borders on nationalism.

The readiness of the petty bourgeoisie to embrace national-chauvinism (fascism), a corporative system, the so-called new order, in pre-war Germany is a typical example of its

bent for nationalist hysteria. And this despite the fact that fascism represented the interests not of the petty bourgeoisie, but of the aggressive elements of the big imperialist bourgeoisie. This was also the case in other European countries, such as Italy, Spain and Portugal, and in Latin American countries.

Eager to preserve, and sometimes to better, its social position, the petty bourgeoisie frequently sides with political dictatorships, firm rule, and strong personalities, whom it regards as essential for consolidating the nation, and protecting national interests.

Those are the reasons behind rightist nationalist leanings among the petty bourgeoisie, while fear of proletarianisation gives rise to various "leftist" extremes. This explains the extremely wide range of forms of petty-bourgeois nationalism—from extreme "left" to extreme right.

So far we have mainly dealt with the rightist varieties of petty-bourgeois nationalism, which resemble the nationalism of the ruling bourgeoisie. But it should be remembered that the concrete social content of the democratic element in some forms of petty-bourgeois nationalism may differ. This depends on the historical situation. When bourgeois nations were only in the formative stage, the class content of the democratic element of petty-bourgeois nationalism was anti-feudal. In present conditions, it may be anti-imperialist or anti-monopoly.

**Nationalism
in Countries
Fighting
for Social
and National
Emancipation**

The nationalism in countries that have embarked on social and national emancipation differs in social place and content from the historical varieties of nationalism we have so far examined.

This is due to socio-economic peculiarities and the specific correlation of national and class factors.

Here nationalist tendencies are influenced by the degree of class differentiation, the variety of economic forms, the long record of economic and political dependence and concomitant underdevelopment of social-ethnic communities, and the politico-ideological influence of imperialism.

The special place of this variety of nationalism stems from the principal contradictions of the present historical epoch. In the developed capitalist countries nationalism took shape during the emergence of capitalism and its world system, whereas nowadays the nations and nationalities come into being in newly-liberated countries in a world of two systems, the capitalist and socialist.

Scholars note the extraordinary class diversity of nationalism in countries aspiring to social emancipation. Apart from a nationalism of the same class nature as bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism in the developed capitalist states, other forms have gained prominence, such as the nationalism of transitional pre-bourgeois social structures. Students of the present-day national liberation movement observe, for example, that nationalism as a social movement is not a homogeneous phenomenon. It affects the moderate, and frequently even reactionary, members of the national bourgeoisie, and also the more radical and progressive members of the revolutionary-democratic trend.

What is more, scholars say, some nationalist elements in those countries have their roots in the remote past of the social-ethnic communities. On the African continent, they maintain, where in some areas survivals of the ancient early class organisation of society are still in evidence, feudal ideology intertwines with ideology based on local heathen faiths and tribal cults. The ideology of the tribal leaders, tribalism, derives from tribal particularism, deification of ancestral spirits and mystification of the power of tribal chiefs.

Other nationalistic trends are a one-sided form of resistance to colonialism and neo-colonialism. And last but not least, the nationalist tendencies of the reactionary element are rooted in its resistance to revolutionary change, in the fear of losing its privileges.

In India, for example, reactionaries urge an isolationist policy, which, they contend, assures national independence best of all. The rightist Swatantra Party, for example, urges the government to follow a policy of complete isolationism until India is able to stand on its own feet and re-

fuse the compromises typical of its present foreign policy.

It is the diversity of social and economic structures in these countries that produces the unusual assortment of nationalist tendencies. There are left as well as right nationalist conceptions, which often intertwine.

During the long national liberation struggle there also appeared in many countries the conservative and protective nationalism of the local oligarchy, which never fails to pass off its interests as those of the whole nation. In some countries this oligarchy consists either of the tribal chiefs or feudal lords and estate-owners, or the bureaucratic apparatus connected with the exploiting element. Rightist nationalism also includes different forms of religious nationalism (Buddhist, Islamic, etc.), black or coloured racism, and different forms of so-called continental nationalism (Asian, African and Latin American). All these forms are adroitly exploited by international monopoly and local oligarchy to consolidate their domination and weaken the national liberation movement.

It should not be overlooked, however, that all of them are, in effect, a social protest against colonialist oppression. Black racism, for example, is to a certain extent a response to white racism. Similarly, continental nationalism may also reflect the fact that most of the peoples of the continent were, or still are, dependent or oppressed.

To understand the nationalism in countries that opted for social and national emancipation we should distinguish the historical place of the national bourgeoisie in the present epoch and that of the bourgeoisie at the time of the emergence of capitalism. During the formation of bourgeois nations, the bourgeoisie, then still a developing class, represented a progressive anti-feudal tendency. At present, seen as a class, it no longer represents that progressive tendency, is dualistic and inconsistent in its approach to the national question. All the same, it can and has played a distinctly progressive role in some liberated countries as the bearer of bourgeois democracy in the struggle against imperialist colonialism.

The inconsistent attitude of the national bourgeoisie towards the national question is illustrated by the fact that eruptions of anti-imperialist nationalism mingle with agreements with, and concessions to, international imperialism. The anti-imperialist element of such nationalism derives from the bourgeoisie's reluctance to share profits with foreign imperialism. Its content is also influenced by the scale and scope of the anti-imperialist national liberation movement and the correlation of class forces at home and internationally.

The liberative democratic element is more prominent in the ideology and policy of the national-revolutionary democrats, who come mainly from middle strata of a petty-bourgeois nature. It does not follow, however, that their nationalism is identical with the petty-bourgeois nationalism in developed capitalist countries. Due to the peculiar class differentiation in the developing states, the political conception of the national-revolutionary democrats lacks a clear class content. Nonetheless, it reflects the interests of the majority of the labouring masses, giving expression to the anti-imperialist character of the national liberation movement.

Certainly, there is a difference between the present-day national-revolutionary democratism and the revolutionary democratism of the more remote past. The role of national-revolutionary democratism is all the greater, the greater is its connection with the struggle for socialist reconstruction in countries that fling off the colonial yoke and embark on non-capitalist development.

The nationalism in countries working for social and national emancipation is, therefore, an independent historical variety. It has many specific forms and features absent in the "classical" bourgeois nationalism. (A more detailed analysis is offered in the second part of this book.)

**Nationalist Trends
in Socialist Countries**

As a social phenomenon nationalism is totally foreign to the socio-economic nature, class structure, and ideology of socialism. In fact, in the case of mature socialist society, nationalism is logically and absolutely incompatible with so-

cialism. However, the transition from capitalism to socialism on the world scale, occurring as countries perform socialist revolutions one by one and end the capitalist system, the past history of these countries and their specific relation to each other, do give rise to deviations which, in a restricted sense, may be regarded as a historical variety of nationalism. However, there is no question of any "socialist nationalism", because socialism and nationalism are by nature incompatible. These trends are a historical variety of nationalism deriving from specific causes in the conditions of the present-day socialist system.

What are the grounds for speaking of a special historical variety of nationalism in the present-day socialist countries? Nationalism is not novel in the labour and revolutionary movement. Marx, Engels and Lenin devoted much of their energy to combating nationalist deviations. Lenin described nationalism as a major reason behind the betrayal of the Second International. By the same token, elements of nationalism are not novel in socialist construction. The Soviet Union's experience shows that nationalist deviations are liable to arise during the socialist reconstruction of a multinational society.

But no matter how strong these manifestations of nationalism were, they were invariably repulsed by the Communist Party, because they were in opposition to the Party's general Marxist-Leninist line. Nor were they ever dominant.

The novel factor is that nationalist trends have surfaced in some Communist parties. This was recorded by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the CC of the Bulgarian Communist Party, in his speech at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow. "Unfortunately," he said, "nationalist tendencies have also appeared in the communist movement, which has always taken a legitimate pride in its internationalism. Nationalism has become an especial danger to some Parties which are in power in their countries."¹

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, Prague, 1969, p. 289.

This is why we may classify the present manifestations of nationalism in the socialist system as a special historical variety. In other words, we are dealing with a new social phenomenon, and must analyse its qualities, forms, causes and manifestations in individual countries. (A fuller examination of the origin of nationalist trends in socialist society, and their main forms, is given in the chapter specially devoted to this subject.)

This variety of nationalism stems from the concrete historical conditions of the existence and struggle of the two world systems—socialism and capitalism. Nationalist tendencies are not a necessary element in the logic of socialist development. By nature and essence nationalism is foreign to the communist movement and socialism. In the socialist system nationalist tendencies are expressive of the specific features of the contention of the two world systems and the different degrees of maturity that socialism has attained in countries that departed from the capitalist system.

**Classification
of Historical
Varieties
of Nationalism**

Classifying the historical varieties of nationalism is indispensable for revolutionary practice based on internationalist principles, as well as for scholarly study. Each specific variety

is traceable to specific social causes. Therefore, to overcome nationalism we must first learn these causes, and the conditions in which the specific variety originated.

The historical approach obliges us to work out principles and criteria for classifying the historical varieties of nationalism as a social phenomenon. Twentieth-century bourgeois theorists, too, have shown a great deal of interest in the subject. Louis Wirth, for example, published an article, "Types of Nationalism", in the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1936, suggesting the following types: hegemony, particularist (secession), and marginal nationalism, and, last but not least, national minority nationalism. The faults of this classification are obvious. For one thing, the types represent pure abstractions. No attempt is made to establish their historical development. Moreover, the division into types is

arbitrary, and the author admits the difficulty of defining the boundary between marginal and minority nationalism.

But the most glaring fault is the conception of nationalism as a phenomenon existing apart from the relationship of classes and social groups, and from their conflicts, clashes and struggles.

The classification suggested by Carlton J. H. Hayes, a pioneer in this field in the United States, is more complex. Hayes divides nationalism into five main types: 1) humanitarian nationalism of the Enlightenment, 2) Jacobin nationalism of the time of the French revolution, 3) traditional nationalism, 4) liberal nationalism, and 5) integral nationalism of the fascist type.¹ Hayes attempts to examine these types on a historical plane, which, indeed, is reflected in his classification.

However, to our mind, it is also defective. Hayes examines nationalism as a purely ideological concept, and not as a social phenomenon, policy and practice. This limits the content of nationalism. Nor does Hayes attempt to distinguish between the national and nationalist. He conceives nationalism as a phenomenon typical of the entire nation, as the loyalty of all its members to the national state, as national patriotism. This prevents Hayes from establishing the really basic types of nationalism.

The simplest, but also far from perfect, classification of nationalism is suggested by Hans Kohn, the US sociologist, in his book, *The Idea of Nationalism*. He offers two main types of nationalism, namely, nationalism of the Western world and non-Western nationalism, which he ascribes to nearly all the Asian peoples.² His geographical approach complicates matters and prevents us from seeing the real historical varieties of nationalism in the modern world. Kohn simply misses the exceedingly complex pattern of nationalism.

¹ C.J.H. Hayes, *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism*, N.Y., 1931.

² H. Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism. A Study in Its Origins and Background*, N. Y., 1944.

True, classifications are always relative and to a certain extent contrived. They should not be treated as inflexible. Their main purpose is to encompass as broadly as possible the aggregate of the essential properties of a phenomenon as these evolve through history. This should be remembered when analysing nationalism, an extremely complicated social phenomenon. It is essential to examine all its historical premises and sources, its variety of forms, tendencies and perspectives; moreover, this must be based on an assessment of the class content, political role, and the social and epistemological reasons for its appearance and existence. Nothing but an analysis of the concrete manifestations of nationalism, encompassing all its essential properties, will enable us to single out the historical varieties, determine their social content, causes and origins, and their place and role in the social process.

A Marxist scholar, too, has attempted to classify nationalism. M. S. Dzhunusov lists three types of nationalism: pre-bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, and bourgeois.¹ His interesting study helps to pinpoint the historical movement of nationalism, the main stages in its development, and directs the researcher to the general and specific causes breeding types of nationalism.

We hold, however, that many important aspects require further study. Despite definite specific disparities, for example, the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois nationalisms have the same foundation. They are a class-distorted reflection of the national problems of bourgeois society and form one historical variety of nationalism. Neither does Dzhunusov's classification show the specific features of nationalism in the present transitional social structure of countries that have recently thrown off colonialism.

By virtue of our study so far, we could suggest a more workable classification, based on a differentiation of historical varieties of nationalism. A historical variety of nation-

¹ See M. S. Dzhunusov, *The Class and Epistemological Roots and the Social Functions of Nationalist Ideology* (in Russian).

alism, as we have said, is a definite type of nationalism stemming from the concrete socio-economic class content of the socio-economic formation or historical epoch. Given this principle, we could list the following historical varieties of nationalism:

1) pre-bourgeois nationalism; 2) bourgeois nationalism, including different forms and manifestations of nationalism among the ruling big bourgeoisie, and also petty-bourgeois nationalism; 3) the nationalism of the present transitional social structures; 4) nationalistic deviations within the present socialist system.

In general terms, the historical movement of nationalism, as we see it, may be described as follows:

First, a long formative stage of the historical preconditions and separate elements of nationalism, particularly in slave society.

Second, the feudal epoch, the birth within it of capitalist relations, which serve as the basis for the formation of bourgeois nations. Here the exaggeration of the national element follows two distinct trends: pre-bourgeois nationalism, and various forms of the nationalism of the rising bourgeoisie.

Third, the time of the ascendant development of capitalism, with many forms of bourgeois nationalism and survivals of pre-bourgeois nationalism (of secondary significance).

Fourth, the imperialist epoch, in which the various forms of bourgeois nationalism exercise the determining influence, with reactionary conservative factors taking precedence over the earlier democratic factors.

Fifth, the present period in history, in which imperialism is in decline and the world socialist system is steadily growing stronger. In the socialist world, the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism reign supreme in psychology, ideology, politics, and social practice, but nationalist trends appear as a historical variety of nationalism. In the non-socialist world, meanwhile, various forms of bourgeois nationalism continue to prevail alongside a new historical variety—the diversified nationalism of countries working for social and national liberation.

No doubt, this classification is at best only a sketch or project, and must still be finalised. But its differentiation of historical varieties of nationalism yields a more scientific idea of the various forms of nationalism, the place and role of each of its components in modern society, enables us to determine their origin and devise effective ways of combating modern nationalism.

CHAPTER IV

THE ESSENCE AND HISTORICAL CONTENT OF NATIONALISM

Now that we have classified and examined the main historical varieties of nationalism, we must determine the elements all of them have in common. The term "nationalism" was first used scientifically by the German rationalist, Adam Weishaupt, in 1798.¹ After the French revolution it became part of the legal and political ideology. From political ideology it spread to the social sciences. But its content changed in step with history. Furthermore, its use by different social sciences (political economy, philosophy, ethnography, history, anthropology, etc.) left a specific imprint, depending on the special field and direction of research.

This is reflected in the many, often conflicting, definitions of nationalism. There are broad and narrow definitions. There is unintended confusion and deliberate falsification.

Bourgeois Definitions of Nationalism

Bourgeois scholars are doing considerable research in this field. In his book, *Modern Nationalism*, Professor K. Symmons-Symonolewicz, for example, examined some 200 fundamental works on national relations and nationalism. But the absence of scientific research principles has prevented bourgeois scholars from producing a conclusive definition of the term "nationalism".

¹ Boyd C. Shafer, *Nationalism. Myth and Reality*, N. Y., 1955, p. 132.

Some bourgeois scholars shy away from the task entirely.¹ Others say no adequate definition is possible. Jan Romein, the historian, says: "We can give no definition nor are history and the other social sciences fitted to supply one."²

Yet many scholars try. And examining their definitions, we should proceed from the scheme suggested some 50 years ago by Hayes, who influenced later students of nationalism. According to Hayes, the term "nationalism" may be referred to 1) the actual historical process of the establishment of nationalities as political units; 2) to the political philosophy of the nation-state; 3) to a popular movement or the activities of political parties of a nationalist orientation; 4) the condition of mind among members of a nationality.³ The *US Dictionary of the Social Sciences* offers a cumulative scheme, in which the main connotations of nationalism are listed as follows: 1) a form of group consciousness; 2) ideologies designed to justify nation-states; 3) a modern historical process.⁴

Those are excessively broad characteristics. They fit any movement or social phenomenon in the least connected with national relations, the national liberation movement. The class element, meanwhile, inherent in any variety of nationalism, is totally overlooked.

Seton-Watson's conception of nationalism, as presented in his *Nationalism and Communism*, is another excessively broad approach. By nationalism Seton-Watson means a movement against colonial or any other dependence, racial discrimination and inequality.⁵ Any national liberation movement and its ideology fit into the picture. Yet the correlation of the national and nationalist, the ideology of the

¹ K. Symmons-Symonolewicz, *Modern Nationalism: Toward a Consensus in Theory*, N. Y., 1968.

² Jan Romein, *The Asian Century. A History of Modern Nationalism in Asia*, London, 1962, p. 30.

³ C. J. H. Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism*, N.Y., 1926, p. 5.

⁴ J. Gould and W. Kolb (eds.), *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, N.Y., 1964.

⁵ Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nationalism and Communism. Essays 1946-1963*, London, 1964, p. 50.

national liberation movement and nationalist ideology—which are part of nationalism—is left out.

Some bourgeois scholars have produced a more specific definition. They usually take one of the properties in Hayes' scheme or that of the *Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. A selection of definitions could be listed, based on one of the properties of the Hayes scheme, namely, the political philosophy of the nation-state. For example, Gerth and Mills define nationalism as "the justifying ideology of a nation-state or of a nation aspiring to become a state".¹ K. H. Silvert says in his *Nationalism in Latin America*, that "nationalism as a social value refers to ... the secular state as the ultimate arbiter of all conflicts of public interest".²

J. Kennedy, author of *Asian Nationalism in the XX Century*, finds fault with most of the known definitions of nationalism, and offers his own: "Nationalism ... is a concept in which the loyalty and allegiance of the individual are held to be due primarily to the nation-state."³

These references to the individual's loyalty to the national, in particular the bourgeois national state, as the main characteristic of nationalism, are widespread in bourgeois, especially American, literature.⁴

We could not wish for a better illustration of how the class essence of nationalism is camouflaged. Bourgeois ideologists want just one thing: to assert the principle of loyalty to the state, which they conceive exclusively as an instrument of bourgeois rule.

Another group of bourgeois definitions of nationalism is based on psychological factors, e.g., the mutual affection and solidarity of members of a national group. One of the

¹ H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, *Character and Social Structure*, N. Y., 1953, p. 198.

² K. H. Silvert, "Nationalism in Latin America" in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 334, March 1961, p. 4.

³ J. Kennedy, *Asian Nationalism in the XX Century*, N. Y., 1968, p. 3.

⁴ Hans Kohn, *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*, N. Y., 1955, p. 10.

authors of the collection, *Nationalism in Canada*, for example, defines nationalism as "simply the manifestation of the natural and spontaneous solidarity that exists among members of a human group sharing a historical and cultural tradition from which the group derives its distinctive identity".¹

The vagueness of the formula, "natural and spontaneous solidarity" and the emphasis on tradition, show that the author, in effect, ignores the ideology of nationalism, as well as its objective foundation. The accent is mainly on the sensual, psychological aspects, while all the other properties of nationalism, this highly complex social phenomenon, are either deliberately or unconsciously disregarded. The content of the concept "nationalism" is thereby distorted, and nationalism's actual place and social role totally misrepresented.

We could list many more definitions in which their bourgeois authors emphasise mainly the psychological factor. Richard W. Cottam, for example, defines nationalism as "a belief on the part of a large group of people that they comprise a political community, a nation, that is entitled to independent statehood, and a willingness of this group to grant their community a primary and the terminal loyalty".² James S. Coleman, a student of Nigeria, defines nationalism as "a consciousness of belonging to a nation (existent or in the realm of aspiration) or a nationality, and a desire, as manifest in sentiment and activity, to secure or maintain its welfare, prosperity, and integrity, and to maximise its political autonomy".³

In sum, bourgeois definitions of nationalism have many methodological faults. Firstly, they identify the national and nationalist. Secondly, nationalism as a social phenomenon is often reduced to feelings, a state of the mind or spirit, an

¹ *Nationalism in Canada*, Toronto, New York, London, 1966, p. 47.

² R. W. Cottam, *Nationalism in Iran*, Pittsburgh, 1964, p. 3.

³ J. S. Coleman, *Nigeria. Background to Nationalism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1958, p. 425.

attitude of the individual to the national state. Thirdly, and this is the most important, the politico-ideological class content of nationalism is totally neglected. The arbitrary choice of properties of nationalism in the bourgeois definitions, their deliberate looseness, pursue definite class aims.

Yet there is an urgent need for dotting all the i's in the concept of nationalism in general and present-day nationalism in particular. Marxist literature defines it as the ideology and policy of the bourgeoisie in relation to the national question.

But to conceive nationalism as exclusively a bourgeois ideology and policy in relation to the national question blunts its concept, leading possibly to one-sided methods of combating nationalism. If all historical varieties of nationalism were classed as bourgeois nationalism, this could lead to the conclusion that to eliminate nationalism we need only overcome the influence that bourgeois ideology and policy has on the national question.

Certainly, the significance of the struggle against bourgeois nationalism should not be minimised. Certainly, the influence of bourgeois ideology and policy ranks high among the reasons behind the origin of nationalism and its penetration into the world communist movement, and into some of the socialist countries. This occurs through many channels and in different forms, and by subtle and highly refined methods. János Kádár, leader of the Hungarian Communists, emphasised at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow that "it is necessary to step up the struggle against bourgeois ideas infiltrating our ranks, against revisionist and dogmatic views which distort the principles of Marxism-Leninism and lead people onto a false path. *Of the bourgeois views, the nationalist views, particularly the form of nationalism expressed in anti-Sovietism, are unquestionably the most dangerous for our movement.*"¹

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 331.*

To combat nationalist phenomena in a communist environment we must overcome the influence of bourgeois ideology and policy on the national question, and work out counter-methods and counter-moves that would eliminate it entirely. This is not easy to accomplish, because world imperialism continuously devises new methods of injecting the bourgeois ideology into the communist milieu. To encourage nationalist deviations in the world communist movement, it uses the press, radio, television, cinema, etc., and a highly ramified system of agents.

**The Content
of the Concept
of Nationalism**

All this only underscores the need for a precise definition of the content of nationalism, for analysing its more essential aspects. To be sure, we do not want some definition of formal logic. What we need is a conceptual one, encompassing the main elements and establishing the interrelation between them and their role and forms. It is impossible to define and work out effective means of doing away with the harm of nationalism, unless we know its substantive aspects and their interaction and influence.

Analysing the content of any scientific concept, we define its components and the relation between them. Nationalism, as we have said, is a distorted reflection of the national element and its relation to other social problems at different levels of the social consciousness and in social practice. Therefore, its concept should not be restricted to ideology and policy only. A distorted reflection of the place and role of the national element may originate at the level of the common everyday consciousness through the development of the national into a nationalist psychology.

The national psychology, which takes shape naturally in the development of social-ethnic communities, is not identical with nationalism and nationalist psychology. Yet it is precisely in a concrete historical situation at the social-psychological level of the social consciousness that there arise such elementary psychological elements as a negative disposition to other nations, as nationalist stereotypes, and the like.

These psychological elements are widespread and tenacious, and hold a place of prominence in the public consciousness. They are the raw material for ideological and political nationalist concepts. They are part of the concept of nationalism, are the food of nationalist ideology, and facilitate the implementation of nationalist policy. Combating nationalism, we must therefore consider not only its ideology and policy, but also the psychological elements. There is a reverse connection between nationalist psychology and ideology: the former is the mass base for the latter, while the latter enters the mass consciousness through the efforts of ideologues, giving rise to all kinds of nationalist ideas.

On a higher level of social consciousness than social psychology (the level of ideology) there occurs a theoretical processing and the creation of a system of nationalist views based on definite class positions, resulting in a distorted reflection of the national element, which occupies the leading place in nationalism.

The element of distorted national self-awareness arising at the psychological and ideological levels, becomes a conspicuous part of the political action of parties and social groups, or entire classes. Through political activity the nationalist elements in psychology and ideology become objective. In other words, political action yields objective practical results. Hence, nationalism is not only psychology, ideology and policy, but also practice—practice that introduces definite changes into the social reality, reflected at different levels of the social consciousness.

As we see, nationalism encompasses the psychological and ideological levels of nationalist consciousness, policy as a means to the nationalist aims, and certain aspects of social practice, in which the results of the nationalist activity are concentrated. Certainly, these composites of nationalism are interactive. Each plays a definite part. In general terms, however, the practical results are the most significant, followed by the political, and then the ideological and psychological elements in this order. True, in specific historical situations their place and order of significance may change abruptly.

It is necessary and right to consider the national element, national interests, and national relations. There are two sets of reasons—epistemological and social-political—for the transformation of the national into nationalist.

The epistemological reasons derive from the difficulty of cognition, of reflecting the objective dialectics of the organisation and movement of society, and from the conflicting nature of their reflection in the consciousness. Cognition of the dialectics of social phenomena should follow the Marxist principle of objective and thorough analysis from the concrete historical angle. Dogmatic or relativist definitions of the place and social role of the national element, of the connection between the universal, class and national; neglect of the historical aspect, one-sidedness and arbitrary subjectiveness are anti-dialectical.

The object of cognition is multifaceted. Its ties with other aspects of reality are highly diverse. Moreover, the cognitive process is a complex and conflicting one. The resulting reflection is therefore quite liable to be inadequate.

However, these epistemological reasons for the national to change into nationalist, do not by themselves breed nationalism. It springs mainly from socio-political factors, which give impulse to the epistemological reasons. A closer examination will follow in subsequent sections. Here, we shall merely list these factors: the relations in an exploiter society, which are at the root of the oppression of some nations or nationalities by others; economic, political, and cultural distinctions between social-ethnic communities; basic qualitative changes of the national element (e.g., the formation of bourgeois nations); the influence of social changes and changes in relations between nations; reactions of response to chauvinism; conservation of traditions, the way of life and religious cults; consolidation and support, and sometimes revival, of nationalist prejudices, habits, and views, in acute social situations. Cumulatively, these may be cited, among others, as the socio-political reasons for the national to turn into nationalist.

The determining role in the growth of the national into nationalist is played by the political class element. Definite social groups, classes and political alignments use the national element to promote their particular aims in home and foreign policy, to portray the self-seeking interests of the dominant classes as the interests of the whole nation, and to obscure the irreconcilable class contradictions within the nation.

These are the aims of nationalist ideological and political conceptions, and nationalist political measures, including inculcation of nationalism in the mass consciousness and the use of nationalist conceptions in public practice.

**The Essence and
Historical Content
of Nationalism**

Nationalist ideology, exclusively centred on the national element, or evaluating all other social processes and defining political and other objectives from the national angle, is invariably a distorted form of reflecting the social being. It is therefore incorrect, unscientific, conservative or reactionary, and represents a passage to nationalism.

Consequently, the essence of any historical variety and form of nationalism amounts to distortion and over-emphasis of the national element for egoistic class purposes. In this sense nationalism is always an inadequate and distorted reflection of reality, and therefore an egoistic social activity by a definite class.

It seems appropriate, too, to introduce correctives in the notion that there is a "progressive" and a "reactionary" nationalism. Those who make this distinction usually refer to Lenin, citing the following passage from his "Notes for the Resolution on the National Question": It is insistently necessary to define at length and in detail one's attitude to the national question for reasons a) historical (objective): reactionary nationalism and bourgeois-progressive (even bourgeois-democratic) nationalism of the counter-revolutionary epoch...¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 377 (in Russian).

Yet in many other works Lenin refers to Marxism's firm opposition to any and all forms of nationalism. He says, for example, that in Marxists "all chauvinism and nationalism will find an implacable enemy...",¹ and that "Marxists resolutely oppose nationalism in all its forms...".²

In view of the seeming contradiction between the formula in his "Notes for the Resolution on the National Question" and what he said elsewhere, it may be worth our time to examine this point more closely.

What did Lenin consider progressive in nationalism, and what exactly did he think should be supported? In "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", he said: "The bourgeois nationalism of *any* oppressed nation has a general democratic content that is directed *against* oppression, and it is this content that we *unconditionally* support. At the same time we strictly distinguish it from the tendency towards national exclusiveness; we fight against the tendency of the Polish bourgeois to oppress the Jews, etc., etc."³

On a general theoretical plane, considering this flexible approach to nationalism from different angles, we should probably distinguish between the essence of nationalism and its concrete historical content. The essence of every historical variant of nationalism is distortion and over-emphasis of the national element by one or more of the exploiting classes or social groups, which, in the final analysis, conflicts with the truly revolutionary tendency. The concrete historical content of nationalism is related to, and determined by its essence, but is considerably broader. Some part of it may encompass relatively progressive, democratic elements, and to these Lenin referred as meriting support.

As we see it, it is therefore wrong to apply Lenin's assessments of the democratic factors in the concrete historical content of nationalism to the entire social phenomenon of nationalism. Identifying the democratic, relatively progressive elements present in nationalism with the entire phenom-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 421.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 548.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 412.

enon may lead to the incorrect conclusion that nationalism is progressive. In strictly scientific terms we can refer only to the progressiveness of the democratic elements in the content of nationalism, but certainly not of nationalism generally.

The presence of democratic elements in the concrete historical content of a variety of nationalism depends not on the national, but on the class factor, on what class is at the head of the national movement, on its aims, and on the methods suggested to resolve the social and national problems. The more progressive the social group or class at the head of the social and national liberation movement, the more extensive are the democratic elements in its ideological and political concepts.

To determine this is important for social practice, in order to decide what the Communists should support in a historical variety of nationalism, which of its aspects should be combated, and which should be supported.

It must be perfectly clear, however, that none but the democratic elements deserve any measure of support. The Communist parties can support the democratic elements in a variety of nationalism without in any way conceding the principles of proletarian internationalism.

While supporting the democratic elements of nationalism, the Communists make it their business to combat nationalism as such. The Communists' attitude towards the various historical types of nationalism thus compounds the aim of eliminating this distorted reflection of the national element, while promoting the democratic elements, encouraging them to outgrow and get rid of nationalism. The Communists' essential purpose is to remodel reality along socialist lines by revolutionary means. "However, we cannot move towards that goal," Lenin said, "unless we combat all nationalism, and uphold the equality of the various nations."¹

The Marxists' political and ideological attitude towards nationalism distinguishes between the essence of nationalism

¹ Ibid., p. 413.

and its concrete historical content. To overcome nationalism as an exaggeration and distortion of the national element, one must combat this exaggeration in all the historical varieties and forms of nationalism.

True, Lenin's words about the antithesis of bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism as the two basic world outlooks may be taken to deny the fundamental standpoint of this paper about the existence of different historical varieties of nationalism. We may be told that Lenin's statement negates the view that apart from bourgeois nationalism there are also other historical varieties.

Yet Lenin's idea that bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism are diametrically opposite should be taken to mean that any historical variety of nationalism is ultimately, in our time, contiguous with bourgeois nationalism, beneficial to the bourgeoisie, consonant with its class interests, because it divides the working people and weakens their united international front.

To sum up, let us suggest a definition of nationalism based on the preceding analysis. A scientific definition of nationalism as a social phenomenon should meet the following three requirements: first, it should reflect the class nature of nationalism; second, it should show the main purpose of all its essential elements; third, it should produce a cumulative picture of its main historical varieties. Acting on these requirements, we may suggest the following definition:

Nationalism, the opposite to proletarian internationalism, is a psychology, ideology, policy and social practice that set apart one's own social-ethnic community, are hostile to other communities, and materialise in different historical varieties that ultimately conform with the interests of the exploiting classes and tend to weaken the labouring masses in the struggle against their class enemies.

These days the world revolutionary movement has to face up to an aggregate of historical varieties of nationalism, which, despite their distinctions, may be and are used by the imperialist oligarchy to counter the socialist trend of our times. For the world communist movement nationalism is a

foreign body, because in effect it is a departure from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

**The Dialectics of
the Class Factor,
the National
and International
in the World
Revolutionary
Process**

In present-day society the dialectical nature of socio-economic, class, political and national relations stands out in bold relief. The break-up of historically-shaped social structures is altering the relation of the class, national and international elements, as

reflected in the content of modern nationalism and proletarian internationalism.

The main streams of the world revolutionary process give expression to the socialist trend of the present-day epoch, the essence of which is humanity's transition from capitalism and pre-capitalist modes to socialism and communism, presupposing a radical transformation of all aspects of social life, including the class, international and national elements of the social structure.

In contrast to the bourgeois objectivist, the materialist who uses Lenin's methods first determines "exactly what social-economic formation gives the process its content, *exactly what class* determines this necessity".¹

The novel factor in the modern world is that not the exploiting classes, but the international working class—the principal productive and social-political force of our time—is the centre of the present epoch. It is the international working class that determines the direction of social development and is the motive force, the mainspring, of social progress.

Accordingly, the new class content alters and determines the national and international forms of social movement.

The present revolutionary process is international. That is an important feature not only because all countries and peoples, who live in different socio-economic formations, are involved in it, but also and mainly because it reflects the objective tendency towards the internationalisation of all

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 401.

aspects of life. This tendency is making strong headway, despite the variety of socio-economic levels, despite the multiplicity of modes of production, and despite the uneven economic and political development of different countries. Materially, the internationalisation of production and social life is based on the growth of the productive forces and the modern scientific and technological revolution.¹

Internationalisation is in many ways furthered by the modern communication and mass media, the opportunity these offer for extensive intercourse, interaction and reciprocal influence among peoples at different levels of historical development. This tends to alter the objective conditions for the operation of sociological laws and injects an international element into the social role of each of the components of the social structure and each of the streams of the social movement.

It would be useful, therefore, to examine the changes in the class content and social role of the national element, and also its distorted reflection in nationalism. The national element, as already noted, reflects the aggregate of the relations between social-ethnic communities, and also their relation to the class, professional, religious and other communities. And in its quality of national form, this national element introduces a certain distinctiveness into the modern social movement. To begin with, the formation and development of nations was, as a rule, a concomitant of the emergence of the capitalist social-economic formation; second, as a form of social-ethnic community, the nation (the highest, most mature and historically last community of this type) develops within the territorial limits of a state; third, the imperialist epoch violated the natural historical development of social-ethnic communities in the colonial and dependent countries, and introduced a new content into the national-colonial question; fourth, the break-up of impe-

¹ Lenin regarded internationalisation as a derivative of modern large-scale production, which tends to break down national barriers (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 104-05).

rialism's colonial system necessarily adopted the form of national liberation; fifth, the revolutionary struggle of the working class, and especially its victory in socialist revolutions, produced a new setting for a number of problems relating to national relations both in socialist countries and in many of the new states that have risen on the ruins of the colonial system.

In other words, the role of the national element has, to one extent or another, increased in all the streams of the modern social movement. This was especially so in the case of the liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries that have regained their independence from imperialism. Most of these reasons, which have changed the content and role of national problems in the social movement, did not exist in the lifetime of Marx and Engels. They did not become an object of theoretical examination and political practice until Lenin's time.

It is the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of resolving the national question by revolutionary means that puts the development of national relations and the question of their place in society in the right focus.

Revolutionary practice has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist conclusion that national oppression and inequality cannot be completely eliminated until the capitalist system and its aftermaths are finally destroyed. Marx and Engels stressed that the exploitation of one nation by another and hostile relations among nations will end with the ending of class antagonisms within nations, that is, as a result of the socialist revolution of the proletariat. In new historical conditions, in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Lenin developed these ideas into a scientifically-grounded teaching on national-colonial revolutions, showing the connection between the national-colonial question and the question of putting an end to imperialism, showing that the national-colonial question is part of the general question of proletarian revolution.

Leninism outlines the main stages in the development and solution of the national question. A definite historical epoch,

it shows, is the objective basis of each of these stages. Thus, at the time of ascendant capitalism, when the formation and growth of bourgeois nations and centralised states was taking place, the national movement and the national question were principally internal questions and concerned but some of the European, and their subordinate, countries.

The second stage of the national question coincides with the imperialist epoch. The imperialist redivision of the world and seizure of new territories turned the old bourgeois nation-states into multinational imperialist states. Besides, under pressure of monopoly there was a scramble to extend state frontiers and colonial possessions. In this way the national question grew broader and was ultimately fused by the course of events with the general question of colonies. National oppression developed from an internal question into an inter-state question—a struggle (and war) by the “great” imperialist powers to subordinate weaker and underprivileged nationalities.

In its second stage, the national question thus became, as Lenin put it, a world issue in social significance, displaying two objective historical tendencies. “Developing capitalism,” Lenin wrote, “knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the break-down of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc.

“Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism.”¹

The contradiction between these tendencies in the imperialist epoch is made sharper by the fact that international monopoly is internationalising economic life through the enslavement of peoples. Imperialism makes these tendencies antagonistic. This is why the elimination of the contradiction is connected with the struggle to destroy capitalism and,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 27.

consequently, the national question cannot be entirely solved within its framework.

The third stage of the national question is connected with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The basic principles for solving the national question, the basic principles of the national policy of the socialist state, were set forth in 1917 in the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia. And the actual experience of socialist construction in the USSR confirmed the Marxist-Leninist view that a consistent, complete and final solution of the national question is possible only on the socialist basis. In this sense, the Soviet experience of transforming social-ethnic communities into socialist nationalities and nations became the first case when the national question was actually solved.

For a long time, the national and national-colonial question was the basic concrete historical content of the national element in the social structure. However, the solution of the national question under socialism does not mean that national problems disappear completely, that national and inter-national relations cease to exist, that the national element is eliminated.

Take the Soviet Union. There the national question was solved on a socialist basis and all forms of economic, political and cultural inequality between its nations and nationalities were removed.

Yet the very existence of nations and nationalities, of internal national and inter-national relations and problems, is evidence of the existence of the national factor. However, after the exploiting society was destroyed it acquired a new concrete historical content in the multinational socialist country.

"In a mature socialist society, national relations continue to be a constantly developing reality, which keeps putting forward fresh tasks and problems," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said in his report on the 50th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He added: "The Party never loses sight of these questions, tackling them in

due time in the interest of the country as a whole and of every Republic in particular, in the interests of communist construction."

In socialist countries, relations between nations are an important aspect of the national element. It stands to reason that, in contrast to the capitalist system, the world socialist system cannot have a national-colonial question. As for the national question, it has a historical background and is steadily resolved in the course of socialist reconstruction. Since the existence of the world socialist system is a new and prominent objective factor in the operation of historical laws, the solution of the national question in each country embarking on socialism inevitably possesses distinguishing features.

The fourth stage of the national question, therefore, is of interest especially in the case of the new socialist-oriented states, since there political liberation has not yet provided all the internal economic and social conditions for national equality. Among the important external conditions influencing the fourth stage we may name, first, the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; second, the existence of the world socialist system with its fundamentally different type of relations between nations, and, third, the continued existence of the national element in the world socialist system, which will inevitably and continuously encompass more and more countries.

The essential differences in the concrete historical content of the national element in the socialist, capitalist and newly-liberated countries help ascertain its actual connection with present-day nationalism.

**The Features
and Social Role
of Modern
Nationalism**

The special content and forms of nationalism in our time are to be traced to many objective and subjective reasons. The objective include the greater role of the national element in the social movement of the present epoch. Sociologically speaking, the revolutionary content of the present time comprises struggle for social and national equality, against relations of domination and subjection, for relations of cooperation

and mutual aid, and for real equality of large and small nations and nationalities.

It should be borne in mind that due to the uneven historical development of mankind practically all types of social-ethnic community, from tribe to nation, are still in existence. Demographers list some 2,000 social-ethnic communities. These inhabit 200 countries, with nearly two-thirds of the world population concentrated in the ten biggest.

The diversity of social-ethnic communities, the problem of their territorial location, natural migration, and especially the economic and political situation of the peoples, provide evidence of the greater role of the national element in humanity's social structure.

The impact of the national element on the streams of the world revolutionary process has also become greater. Common for all the three revolutionary streams,¹ its social content in each of them is different. The differences stem from the fact that the revolutionary detachments of the different streams work under different conditions in countries and zones with different historical, social, economic, political and national tasks.

The natural national borders of social change, the existence of specific national interests, and the growth of national contradictions impart a special national complexion to the revolutionary movement within each of the three streams. The communist and workers' movement in the developed capitalist countries still has to resolve a whole set of class and national antagonisms, highlighted by the growing contradiction between monopoly and the majority of the people (nation). "This is not only the growth of the contradiction between capital and labour, but also the deepening of the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation and those of the financial oligarchy,"² the

¹ The three revolutionary streams are the world socialist system, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement.—Tr.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 19.

1969 Moscow International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out. In the Latin American countries, where capitalism is either of a low or medium level, the struggle for real national sovereignty and economic independence is linked with a bitter class struggle against capitalist exploitation and, first and foremost, against foreign and local monopolies and landowners. Their anti-imperialist revolutionary movement is of a national-democratic complexion.

The national element is more prominent still in the revolutionary struggle of the independent Asian and African countries. There imperialist-supported home reaction is "kindling conflicts between national, ethnic, religious, tribal and linguistic groups, thereby jeopardising the independence won by these countries".¹

In politically independent countries that are still under the imperialist boot, there is a most intricate intertwining of national and class problems. First, the political liberation of colonial and dependent countries has not so far assured them national and economic independence; second, political consolidation within independent nation-state frameworks serves only as a preliminary condition for the growth into nations of the social-ethnic communities, such as tribes and nationalities; third, imperialism artificially sustains leagues of micro-states and the strife between tribes and nationalities, and also the arbitrary colonial division of peoples, made to live in territorially different political states.

In sum, the national problems of the newly-liberated countries are so deep-rooted and acute that they often obscure the class content of social movements. Due to the meagre class differentiation and the undeveloped class relations, many of these countries are liable to elevate national problems to an absolute, clothed in diverse nationalistic conceptions.

The present-day revolutionary movement, though essentially international, unfolds chiefly within national frame-

¹ Ibid., p. 29.

works. In the developed capitalist countries, gripped by bitter class struggle, this provides fertile soil for both the internationalist and nationalist conception of the national element and its place and social role in the revolutionary movement. Imperialist ideology and policy exercise a visible influence. In the battle for survival against the rising tide of socialism, imperialism pins special hopes on relations within and between nations, on national problems, using nationalism where it can for the preservation of bourgeois society.

The growth of national psychology, ideology, politics and social practice into nationalist occurs in different specific conditions, as a result of which nationalism has many faces, is diverse in content and form. And the contradictory content of modern nationalism, coupled with the fact that it can be used by different classes, is the reason why some detachments of the national liberation movement are liable temporarily to display nationalist colours. This enables nationalism to penetrate deep into the revolutionary movement, to acquire a relatively mass basis, and to some extent influence the ideology and politics of some of the detachments of the liberation movement. At the same time, the reactionary essence of all the varieties and forms of nationalism enables world imperialism to use it for dividing and disrupting the revolutionary forces and the streams of the world revolutionary process. Summing up the theoretical and historical aspects of nationalism as a social phenomenon and a political problem, we might single out some of its historical, ideological, political and structural features.

Historically, *modern nationalism is a distortion of the national elements in the structure of society conditioned by the egoistic interests of the exploiting classes and social groups. It is not single in content or form, but consists of heterogeneous historical varieties.*

Although it is relatively widespread, and at times grows even stronger, it has reached its culmination point as a social phenomenon. In other words, it has no historical future. Having run its course in history, its content provides less ground for the appearance and growth of democratic ele-

ments. More, there are historical varieties (nationalist deviations in the socialist world) that amount to a departure from democracy and play a reactionary role.

The distinctive politico-ideological feature of modern nationalism is that in the final analysis it is a tool of imperialism and political reaction in the non-socialist world, and in the countries of the socialist system a vehicle of the aspirations of anti-socialist, and also left adventurist forces. From this angle, every variety and form of modern nationalism presents an obstacle to the revolutionary socialist trend of the present epoch. This does not change even if its bearers are participants of the general democratic national liberation movement or the proletarian, socialist movement. In the latter case, even doubtlessly sincere revolutionaries carry a banner hostile to their ultimate revolutionary socialist aims.

Modern nationalism is an aggregate of nationalist psychology, ideology, policy and social practice. For all the interdependence of these structural elements, each performs a definite social role. It may be useful, therefore, to analyse the place and social role of the psychological element in modern nationalism. However, since the subject is practically unexplored in modern literature, its special features will be examined in a separate chapter. Here, we shall only list its general features. Nationalist psychology, shaped under the long influence of the exploiting classes, has deep historical roots. Passed down from generation to generation, nationalist feelings, sentiments and prejudices have acquired a relative independence and become profoundly conservative.

Nationalist ideology is usually deliberately formulated, deliberately inculcated, and deliberately used in the various forms of the class struggle. It operates not only in a pure form, but also as part of the political, juridical or religious ideology, or of such forms of social consciousness as the arts. It is able, therefore, not only to penetrate the social consciousness at its ordinary and theoretical levels, but also to influence internal and external policy and social practice.

Consolidation of nationalist policy in social relations and everyday life is a nationalist social practice. This cannot be

exercised by the ruling class alone or by its state machine. It requires the labouring masses, social strata or groups to be contaminated with a nationalist psychosis. And precisely through nationalist social practice the real place of the national element, the national interests and problems, become deformed.

All these special features in the structure and social role of modern nationalism enable imperialism and international reaction to use it as a means of disrupting the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces. Through exploitation of modern nationalism, international reaction is vainly trying to alter the course and content of the international class struggle for social and national liberation.

CHAPTER V

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NATIONALISM

1. The National and Nationalist in Psychology

The previous chapter examined the structural elements of nationalism, their interconnection, interdependence and interpenetration. The present chapter deals with one of these elements—the relatively less studied in Marxist literature: nationalist psychology. The content and mechanics of nationalist mass manifestations of a social-psychological nature are obviously of more than just academic interest. The absence of sufficiently grounded studies of the psychological in nationalism offers scope for speculation with racist, nationalist and chauvinist feelings in the theories and policies of our ideological adversaries, and is the objective foundation for revisionist conceptions of the national interest and for exaggerating national features in matters that are internationalist in content.

The examination should cover the genesis of nationalist psychology, the relation of the national and nationalist in phenomena of a psychological order, the social grounds for the appearance of nationalist psychology, and its mechanisms in the mass consciousness.

A similar study, though with opposite intent, has long been begun by bourgeois ethnopsychology. Its purpose could not be more clearly expressed by the Dutch researchers, H. C. J. Duijker and N. H. Frijda, who wrote: "Knowledge about national character may . . . help to understand an actual or potential enemy. Then it is essentially a weapon: by

exploring his weaknesses and delusions, his norms, values and codes it may contribute to his ultimate defeat. In other words: studying national character may mean forging tools for psychological warfare. Also, it may serve to justify our own hostile attitudes, showing how undesirable, undemocratic, uncivilised our enemy is."¹

As a social phenomenon, nationalism materialises in a definite way of thinking and behaviour among people united in some sort of community and acting jointly for common aims. Therefore, it is not only an ideological and political, but also a social-psychological phenomenon. The grounds for this conclusion are derived from its origin and functioning.

The origin of nationalism is in all cases connected with a distorted reflection of the facts of objective reality in the consciousness of people interacting within a specific social-ethnic community. The existence and functioning of nationalism is marked by a warped consciousness in individuals, social groups or larger masses of people that for social and economic reasons come under its destructive influence. This anomalous condition is clearly visible during the spread of nationalism—whether spontaneous or deliberately directed—because it is inevitably based on irrational psychic processes, i.e., an uncritical absorption of distorted notions about one's own and other social-ethnic communities. This anomalous condition is also witnessed in the subjects of nationalist and chauvinist policy, national discrimination and oppression, national or ethnic prejudices.

Nationalist psychology does not arise by itself, independently of national psychology. It is based on national-psychic constructions over-emphasised under the influence of class interests and turned into an aggregate of distorted and vulgarised ideas about people of one's own and other nations and nationalities—a negative attitude to other social-ethnic communities buttressed by uncritically absorbed experience

¹ H.C.J. Duijker and N. H. Frijda, *National Character and National Stereotypes*, Amsterdam, 1960, p. 158.

and a penchant for biased reactions to information about one's "own" and "alien" ethnic communities.

The existence of national elements in the ordinary consciousness of individuals forming a social-ethnic community is objective and normal. They represent a certain aggregate of psychic factors known as the "psychic pattern of nations", "national character" or "national peculiarities in psychology". Leaving aside the drawn-out controversy among Marxist philosophers as to the advantages of one or another of these terms, and whether or not the concepts they express are among the determining properties of a nation (which is not the object of our examination), it is clear that despite the variety of viewpoints, they fully agree about the part played in society by national-psychic constructions, which are secondary to class distinctions between human communities.

National psychology is probably one of the most difficult objects of research. This is why there is a certain arbitrary approach to setting its boundaries, to its structure and the factors that influence its formation. The absence of sufficiently dependable criteria for its separate components, and the confusion reigning over the issue of the spiritual image of peoples, offers room for quasi-scientific speculation about, say, the "enigmatic Russian soul", the "mysterious artistry of the Italian character", or the "illogicality of Asian thinking". Bourgeois science makes extensive use of this, producing studies that deliberately distort the substance of national-psychological constructions and processes for its own egoistic class interests. As noted by Soviet researcher V. N. Kolbanovsky, "they are all far removed from science, because they essentially serve one and the same aim—the aggrandisement and glorification of the virtues of a chosen nation and the belittling of others as less worthy".

The operation of social factors and the geographic environment leave an imprint on the perception of the outer world, the reactions to objective phenomena, and the emotional qualities of people. These essentially tenacious psychic features become objective qualities of the national culture, and are visible in ideological activity (recall Marx and Engels

on the differences between English and French materialism¹). They are also the basis of national consciousness, which, in addition to the sense of belonging to a definite ethnic community, includes a broad range of feelings, such as national pride, love of country, appreciation of works of the national culture, and the emotionally fortified conviction in the correctness of the ideological propositions and political steps expressing the interests of national development and subjectively apprehended as the interests of the people.

All these features are typical of the overwhelming majority of the members of each nation. Soviet researcher E. A. Bagramov maintains that they reflect in the mind of the members of the nation its peculiar living conditions, the aggregate of the features making up the nation's spiritual image and manifested in the national peculiarities of culture, in different fields of life and work. They are also stable and visible in their life style and in folklore, which reflects the specific qualities of the people's spiritual make-up through the image of its heroes—blacksmith Ilmarinen of the Karelo-Finnish epic, *Kalevala*, or David of Sasun of the Armenian epic. They are also seen in the manner of expressing thoughts and emotions, in customs and traditions, and in the forms of joint activity and public behaviour.

The national psychology includes not only the particular, but also the general, that which is observed in other nations, since the universally human is always part of the national and does not conflict with it in principle. In the dialectical unity of the general and particular, national-psychological constructions, unlike their nationalist distortions, are part of the universally human and are not therefore objectively opposed to the national-particular of any other nation.

Artificial and deliberate exaggeration and subjective counterposition of one's "own" national-particular to the partic-

¹ "The difference between *French* and *English* materialism follows from the difference between the two nations. The French imparted to English materialism wit, flesh and blood, and eloquence. They gave it the temperament and grace that it lacked" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Holy Family*, Moscow, 1956, p. 174).

ular of other nations is, in fact, the beginning of nationalism. The realm of the psychic pattern is the most conveniently and easily penetrated. The contention that one's "own" spiritual image or physical qualities are "the best", are evidence of "unquestionable superiority", has often been, and still is being invoked by adroit manipulators of the social consciousness in pursuance of definite class and political aims. Such manipulation can infect millions of people with the venom of racial or national exclusiveness, obscure class contradictions, split class unity, incite one people against another and prompt them to slaughter each other in imperialist wars, and, in the final analysis, inflict incalculable suffering on all humanity.

The national and nationalist in the psychology of people of a social-ethnic community resemble relations that arise between sound tissue and a malignant growth which lives off the former as a parasite, absorbing its juices and ruining it unless the process is arrested. In the minds of people poisoned by a feeling of superiority and suspicion vis-à-vis other peoples, by a sense of exclusiveness, the national shows a tendency to degenerate, to lose its universal human essence. It becomes fertile soil for the venomous seeds of nationalist ideology, which is a camouflage for the egoistic aspirations of the reactionary classes, forming a screen of rhetoric about "national" aims and interests. It becomes the instrument of extreme nationalist policy, not short of genocide, as witnessed during the First World War on the part of the Turkish chauvinists vis-à-vis the Armenian people, and during the Second World War on the part of German fascism vis-à-vis many other peoples. It becomes a vehicle of immoral social practices, such as the modern forms of racist and national discrimination and segregation.

**Properties
and Features
of Nationalist
Psychology**

In the consciousness of people comprising a specific social-ethnic community there inevitably appear notions and feelings about themselves and also about people of other social-ethnic communities. These notions and feelings, and the concomitant customs and tradi-

tions, moral taboos, ideas of good and evil, and cultural standards, form the complex aggregate of elements of the mass consciousness. They are not a strictly final, theoretically grounded world outlook. But their influence on the thinking and behaviour of people is deep and stable.

In the social-economic conditions of an antagonistic society these notions and feelings become sharper, and tend to exaggerate the positive qualities of one's own community and the negative qualities of others. These processes occurred when the interests of clans and tribes clashed over a hunting ground. They reoccurred over sources of slaves and feudal tributes. And in the capitalist epoch, stereotypes of mass consciousness based on these notions and feelings became a kind of standard in the relations between exploiter nations and exploited nations or nationalities. The exploiting classes cultivated them artificially in order to mould a definite, nationalist psychology.

Nationalism as ideology, policy and social practice cannot exist without such psychological constructions as ethnic or national exclusiveness, suspicion, mistrust and hostility towards other nations and ethnic groups, or conformism in relation to what Marx described as the national traditions of "dead generations" that weigh "like a nightmare on the brains of the living". As an aggregate, these phenomena comprise the psychological sources of elements of the nationalist ideology, developing into nationalist and chauvinist policy, and vindicating the practice of national discrimination.

On the psychological plane, nationalist tendencies possess definite features and properties. In general terms, these are the readiness of individuals, social groups or society as a whole to react with bias to information about other nations and one's own, readiness to distort the reality in which other nations live, and even to negate international values and standards. This state of consciousness usually precedes the appearance of nationalist ideology.

Contrary to the national, nationalist psychology is a distorted and one-sided form of group solidarity with regard

to the values of *one's own* social-ethnic community, and negation of the identical values of *another* ethnic group. The preference of one's own ethnic or national is unquestioning and unconditional where there is the alternative between "own" and "alien"; there are spurious ethnic or national stereotypes—biased, uncritically accepted and emotionally coloured standard notions about other nationalities and nations—and ethnic prejudices, which are predispositions for hostile attitudes towards definite ethnic groups, and also nationalist sentiments and nationalistic public opinion.

These outer trappings of nationalist psychology come into evidence in behaviour—prejudiced utterances and actions. The rights of other nations and nationalities are spurned, creating and sustaining inequality, and sometimes reaching the point of persecution and discrimination. But the same may also be covert, expressed first of all in readiness to absorb nationalistically oriented information.

A study by two American sociologists, Bernard Berelson and Patricia J. Salter, shows that in the forties the most popular and widely-read novels among Americans were those in which the hero or heroine were Anglo-Saxon stereotypes in appearance and character, while the negative personages were mainly of foreign origin. And out of 100 films showing Negroes, the American public liked those 75 best in which the Negroes had negative features.¹

Nationalist psychology is partial to contemptuous names for other nations in newspapers, over the radio and television: Chink, gook, Jap, wop, limey, and many others. US radio and television audiences delight in scandalous, nationalist-oriented information, for example about a businessman's wife being bitten by a dog as she was leaving a hair-dresser's because "the animal thought the lady smelled of

¹ B. Berelson, P. J. Salter, "Majority and Minority Americans: an Analysis of Magazine Fiction" in *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Princeton, Summer 1946, pp. 168-90.

French perfume". American cinema audience prefer the villains to speak English with a strong foreign accent.

**Nationalist
Psychology
Is Tenacious
and Catching**

Manifestations of nationalist psychology are tenacious and catching. Once they seize on the mind, it is very hard to alter them, because the individual's "own" negative view of other social-

ethnic communities appears "genuine" and creates a relationship of "confederacy" with bearers of the same view. Confirmed by experience—the approval of one's environment—and fed by the mass information media, this outlook, coupled with spurious national stereotypes repeated again and again in newspapers, on the radio and television, becomes a rigid foundation for ethnic and national prejudices and breeds nationalist sentiments, assuring conservation of ethnocentrism.

The tenacity of the nationalist psychology is partly due to the fact that it is passed on from parent to child. "Don't shoot till you see a nigger," says the white farmer to his little son "aiming" and "firing" a toy gun from the window of a speeding station-wagon. Experiences of this kind mould and solidify the child's inherited attitude towards Negroes.

Such stereotypes remain in the psyche, because behaviour based on them makes for group solidarity. To recognise your "own" you do not need to paint your face, or ornament your shield, or embroider you shirt. You recognise your "own" by his or her behaviour—what is said or done in reference to your own or other social-ethnic communities. This is a kind of password, showing psychic constructions regarded as "obligatory" before an individual is accepted into a nationalist-oriented community. One racist recognises another by seemingly imperceptible gestures, facial expressions or voice inflexions accompanying a conversation about, say, Negroes in a commuter train in a Northern state of the USA. Society is liable to encourage this. To be a racist is "respectable" in the US South and in Southern Africa. Not to be one is to excite general displeasure, for the environment demands unquestioning conformism.

Elements of nationalist psychology can also be tenacious in an ideological environment that totally negates nationalism. This was pointed out at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties by Comrade Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party. Nationalist tendencies, he said, have not been fully defeated even in the labour movement and persist in the minds of the peoples.¹

Nationalist psychology is contagious. Generally speaking, the contagion spreads, firstly, through the mechanism of uncritical imitation during the formation of a social community subjectively conceived by the individual as "we", which necessarily passes a stage of mutual approximation by individuals and groups, and, secondly, through the mechanism of indoctrination. "Wherever there is a denuded and structurally simple 'we'," Soviet scientist B. F. Porshnev notes, "there is scope for such a social-psychic mechanism as mutual infection."

Nationalist psychology is contagious, because the bearers of a distorted national consciousness in an ethnic community with a relatively simple structure of unity may gain positions in which they are uncritically imitated, or whose information is uncritically accepted.

Uncritical imitation occurs most frequently in juvenile groups. It is less marked in the case of older and more developed individuals. Widespread in the realm of fashions and fads, it also unfortunately occurs in psychic processes accompanying nationalist behaviour.

Behaviour motivated by negative attitudes towards an ethnic group is often an object of uncritical imitation. Youngsters of an ethnic majority sometimes adopt the contemptuous attitude of their elders towards members of an ethnic minority, "those dirty. . .".

Nationalist sentiment is easily stirred up by indoctrination. This is usual in tense or critical situations, when peo-

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 395.

ple are confused, fearful or uncertain, and the source of information possesses prestige while the audience lacks the habit of critical thinking.

Explosions of nationalist sentiment occur with surprising regularity among university students in some Arab and Latin American countries. They usually coincide with some aggravation in the country. However, the political focus may vary: it may be democratic and directed against the power of foreign monopolies, or reactionary and directed against the democratic movement.

2. The Social Basis of Nationalist Psychology

Human consciousness switched into the activity of a social community, developed and changed in step with the historical process and the growth of production. Changes in production tore the bonds that kept people together during the process of joint labour in each of the preceding stages, replacing them with new ones, better suited to the newly-attained level of the productive forces. The changed nature of the bonds within social communities changed their content and form within definite territorial boundaries.

The Historical Movement of the Social-Ethnic Community and Its Reflection in the Psychology

But from the tribal stage on, the historical movement of social communities occurred also within definite ethnic boundaries. And as noted by Soviet researcher L. M. Arkhangel'sky, language, customs, mythology, cult, and friendly clan relations, were typical features of a tribal community. By virtue of a common economic and social pattern, preconditions appeared for a uniform psychological pattern of separately existing population groups. Thus human communities acquired a pronounced ethnic character. The passage from one stage to the next was inevitably accompanied by psychic changes, with people realising the new quality and distinctiveness of their community. And when class society appeared,

this process became more complicated due to changes in the nature of the social (including ethnic) connections.

A considerable psychic change was impelled by the appearance of social relations during the emergence of clans, when biological, essentially sexual, relations ceased to be the main criterion of the primordial human community—the primeval herd. Members of the gens realised their community through joint labour to satisfy their vital needs, discovered that they were mutually dependent in the process of production and established their distinction from other gentes. The unity of the first social community—the gens—was reflected in the communication between its members and was highly primitive in forms barely sufficient to organise the simplest production by a small group of persons.

The subsequent improvement of production altered the content and forms of intercourse. From direct psychological contacts and awareness of their unity within the gens on the basis of jointly performed labour, people advanced in the tribal stage to indirect communication, developing sets of symbols as a means of identifying their “own” from “alien”. These symbols have proved to be highly tenacious and survive in language, folklore, customs, and costumes. In the case of the Evenki gentes and tribes of Northern Siberia, for example, facial tattooing survived as a means of identification until the beginning of this century. And tribal scars—signs identifying “one’s own”—are still common in modern Africa, which is gradually eliminating tribalism and creating new nations within state frameworks.

When tribal alliances first appeared, converting the gentes into what Engels described as “an organisation for plundering and oppressing their neighbours”,¹ and when these alliances became socially stratified, the concept of ethnic community was deliberately used for egoistic ends by the tribal aristocracy. “One’s own” alliance of tribes was artificially elevated in the consciousness of its members to substantiate

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1973, p. 322.

the right of plundering and oppressing "aliens", while the enslaved of "one's own" alliance were expected to seek consolation in their purely symbolic kinship with the "elect" people who "trace their origin to the totems". A little later, in slave society, this is seen more distinctly in the deliberately cultivated contempt shown by the "free" Athenians and Romans for slaves from other tribes. This social-psychological phenomenon—the concept of "one's own" ethnic community and the community of "others", and awareness of the different place of each in the social structure—began to acquire a *class* character and was exploited for *ideological* purposes, that is, as a means of asserting class interests.

When the formation of nationalities was completed during the feudal period, producing a territorial, cultural and ethnic community (even though not quite stable in character), there appeared relatively stable psychic features among the bulk of those comprising the nationality in the form of widespread traits of character reflecting the peculiar natural and social environment, the customs and traditions inherited from the forebears, and in the idea of themselves gleaned from national epics, tales and legends. Despite their linguistic affinity, the people of Hesse, for example, differed from those of Saxony, those of Burgundy from the Normans, and the Tuscans from the Lombards. They were not yet Germans, Frenchmen or Italians, and identified themselves as different from "others" chiefly due to their awareness of their specific features of a psychological order. They apprehended the distinctions in ways of life, pronunciation (different dialects of the same language), in costume, and the like. Once fixed in the popular consciousness, these distinctions often became an object of manipulation by the dominant classes, setting nationalities against each other in the internecine strife of the nobility, suppressing town, guild or estate mutinies, or winning a following for medieval campaigns of conquest.

Alongside the disparities, people gradually perceived points of resemblance. Beside the psychic peculiarities of various nationalities close in ethnic origin, common elements of the psychology of the future nation appeared more clearly dur-

ing the evolution of territorial, economic and cultural community. Soviet ethnographer S. Korolev, for example, analysed the psychic features of the Javanese, Balinese, and other nationalities inhabiting modern Indonesia, and pinpointed some that were typical of all Indonesians.

The formation of nations as a result of capitalist development accelerated and completed the consolidation of common elements in the psychology of the bulk of their members. People began to migrate within the national territory; communications between people living far apart became more intensive. This required analogous psychic reactions to analogous facts. A definite system of moral values arose in the given culture, which the individual had to accept in order to belong to the new type of social-ethnic community—the nation. However, this culture was not a monolith. Due to the division of people into classes within national entities the phenomenon was complex and conflicting, suggesting to Lenin that there were two cultures in every nation.

Growth of the productive forces and production led up to the appearance of national markets. The communities were no longer as segregated as before, for they were no longer able to fully provide for their own needs. National languages took form. As a result the common features of the national character became real, and gave a spiritual identity to every nation. This was a means for its bearers to perceive their unity in contrast to “others”, who lacked the same features of character, type of emotionality, or specific customs and traditions.

The objective (unity and disparity) and the subjective (awareness of unity and disparity) became the psychological background for inter-national relations, which ranged, depending on social and economic conditions, from hostility and mutual suspicion to sincere trust and friendly assistance. The subjective was quickly seized upon by the ruling classes to “divide and rule”, and thereby achieve their political interests. Opportunities for cultivating a sincere trust and friendship were consigned to oblivion by those who made, and continue to make, policy in the class antagonistic society.

Feelings of hostility and mutual suspicion were incited towards other peoples and nationalities.

**The Problem
of "We" and "They"**

It may be useful for an understanding of the objective causes of nationalist psychology to look into the social-psychological problem of "we" and "they", which concerns the most universal form of self-identification in any, including the ethnic, community. The national community, like all others, evolves through the conscious contraposition of "we" and "they". The formation of the Russian nationality, for example, was a subjective apprehension of "we Russians" as distinct from all aliens—"Tatars", "Germans", "Frenchmen", "Turks", etc. This was also the psychological pattern for the formation of the German, Turkish, Tatar and all other national communities—a conscious separation of one-self, one's nationality, from others, as fixed by name, observed in appearance and speech, and most strikingly seen in the disparity of traditions, habits and customs.

This process of psychic differentiation and the grouping of people into definite communities goes back to Antiquity. "Imagine two primordial groups—a gens or tribe," writes B. F. Porshnev. "If they never met before, the individual in group A would not feel that he belonged to some community. Individuals did not differ from each other within the community, and naturally did not distinguish their like from anybody else. It was a community only objectively. For the subjective 'we' to appear, its members had to meet and distinguish themselves from some 'they'. In other words, if we look at the matter in a subjective, psychological context, the 'they' is primary to 'we'." The notion "they" is the first of all social-psychological phenomena.

In the primeval consciousness the "they" were bearers of specific qualities, those who were responsible for invasions, enslavement, or sorcery. "They" were not people, did not understand "human" speech. In short, "they" were not "we". "They" were surrounded by suspicion and alienation, which struck deeper and deeper root over the centuries. Remnants of these feelings, impregnated in the primitive mind of mem-

bers of primeval communities by the experience of hundreds of generations, have survived in the minds of children, who distinguish clearly between "others" and their "own", and who appeal for help and protection to their "own" against "others". These survivals are also seen in the psychology of landmen—their readiness to help their "own", to accept support from their "own" in an "alien" environment of, possibly, ill-disposed people. These survivals have also influenced people's notions about "others", especially about adversaries in military conflicts which, unfortunately, are so abundant in history.

The concept "we", i.e., people's idea of themselves as of a social community, was secondary to the concept "they". "We" ideas originated from an apprehension of the difference from "others"—first as to the tools they used, then the painting of bodies, the dress, language or dialect, and also rites and customs, ornamentation, folk tales, and, last but not least, ethics, morality and the ideological system. At a certain stage the concept "we" stimulated notions about the social-ethnic unity of people with features differing from those of "others" living outside a definite tribal territory. "The tribe," Engels said, "remained the boundary for man, in relation to himself as well as to outsiders."¹ It took thousands of years for a tribal "we" to stop opposing a tribal "they", and just as long for the idea to sink in that both have features common to all human beings.

At the time when nations began to take shape and more or less stable psychic patterns appeared, the antithesis "we" and "they" still had a strong influence. Though a mere survival, it grew sharper and developed—sometimes deliberately (for class reasons)—into ethnocentrism, the basis of present-day nationalist and tribalist psychology.

Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism may be described as an aggregate of widespread irrational notions about one's own ethnic community being the centre for all other communities. These notions are psychological

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 267.

growths of the mass consciousness, resulting in a specific and vulgar conception of one's own people as being generously endowed with positive qualities in a quantity that by far surpasses the same features in other peoples. Ethnocentrism is thus a pronounced inclination to view the values of other peoples through the prism of one's own values, and to deny them in decisions, in activity and behaviour, if the two do not (in fact or imagination) coincide. In its simplest form, ethnocentrism is a sense of satisfaction people experience when hearing or telling jokes about the competitive participation of members of different nationalities in some unusual or absurd situation; whatever the implications of the joke, the best or wittiest solution is invariably credited to the member of one's "own" nationality. In its more complex form, ethnocentrism materialises in, say, political decisions that scorn the interests of other peoples.

Psychologically, ethnocentrism is a form of group identification—an emotional and absolute sharing and acceptance of the values of one's ethnic or national group. This amounts to a mental self-identification with a social-ethnic community, and subjective identification with everything accepted as positive in one's nation or nationality. True, this identification with the values of an ethnic community is not necessarily a feature of ethnocentrism. It is also at the root of national feelings and national self-awareness. One of the results is a complex set of feelings, images and notions that precede or accompany that state of the consciousness, and corresponding behaviour, which is designated by the concept "patriotism". But in the case of ethnocentrism identification with the values of one's ethnic group is not accompanied by any appreciation of civic duties or the desire to serve one's nation, as is the case with patriotism. Unlike patriotism, ethnocentrism contains no civic affection or conscious loyalty to one's country. It is not expressed in people's rational desire to help the economic, social and cultural development of their community. Stripped of the class essence, ethnocentrism is egoistic rather than civic. It gives rise to irrational ideas about the social inferiority of other ethnic groups and to ex-

aggerated national feelings which replace or at times obscure the class approach in evaluating social phenomena.

Together with the accompanying exaggerated national feelings, ethnocentrism is clearly visible in the psychology of oppressed nations, or socially discriminated nationalities. Here identification with the values of one's national or ethnic community becomes a defensive function. For the oppressed or discriminated group ethnocentrism and a spontaneous exaggeration of national feelings compensate for an induced social inferiority complex. Some students of racial and ethnic relations draw attention to this. They ascribe a similar function to the folklore of oppressed and discriminated nations and nationalities, illustrating their claim with a saying popular among American Blacks: the blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice.

Ethnocentrism and its by-products—ethnic, racial and nationalist prejudices—become the psychological basis for nationalism and chauvinism in ideology, politics and social practice. In individuals it gives rise to a sense of national or ethnic exclusiveness, and excessive sensitivity to anything that concerns their national or ethnic group. In society it causes complications, such as racial and national intolerance.

Yet in some situations, excessive national feelings based on ethnocentric integrals in individuals of an oppressed nation or nationality, may coincide in orientation with patriotic feelings. And ideologists of oppressed nations exaggerate national feelings for this reason, in order to prevent the assimilation imposed by the oppressor nations. There have been many enlighteners in the history of the Serbs, Croats, Greeks, Rumanians and Bulgarians, who counteracted assimilation by the Turks and prevented the destruction of their national cultures. Take Lajos Kossuth and Sándor Petöfi, who exposed the national contradictions (so carefully and deliberately disguised by the authorities) between the oppressed Hungarians and the dominant nation in the Austro-Hungarian empire. The ideologists of the Garibaldi movement in Italy likewise incited national feelings against Austrians, as did the Sinn Feiners in Ireland against the English.

Something similar may be observed in the national liberation movements of the present day. However, unlike the past, the national liberation movements of today are influenced by the revolutionary Marxist teaching, and invariably stress the class essence of the struggle and the primacy of class over national interests, though they encourage ethnocentrism in the oppressed nation to develop the democratic elements of nationalism.

But as the aggregate of irrational notions about one's ethnic community, ethnocentrism becomes the psychological basis for national arrogance in the case of oppressor nations. Such ethnocentrism in relation to "strangers" was cultivated in pre-revolutionary Russia and in Austria-Hungary. In fascist Germany it assumed altogether perverse forms. It is cultivated in the United States, Britain and the FRG to substantiate their "right" to world supremacy or "world leadership", or their "responsibility for other peoples". Unfortunately, ethnocentrism is also cultivated in China through propaganda of Han exclusiveness and of the right to boss the ethnic minorities. This leads to the forcible assimilation of ethnic groups totalling 45 million people and to the methodical destruction of the age-old culture and identity of the non-Han peoples—Uigurs, Mongols, Tibetans, Manchus, Kazakhs, Koreans, etc.

Ethnocentrism thrives on conflicting or critical social situations, economic difficulties, breakdowns in the rule of law, border disputes, deliberately provoked dissension linked with past conflicts, and the like. In these conditions it is easily used for political ends. Deliberately stoked national feelings help arouse the ethnocentrism of the nationality comprising the majority of the people. And with national minorities yearning for national and cultural autonomy, especially if frustrated by artificially created barriers, their ethnocentrism bursts forth irrepressibly. This may even occur in countries of the socialist community despite their dominant internationalist ideology. But in the absence of conflicting and critical situations, ethnocentrism is no more visible there than other survivals of former times.

In sum, ethnocentrism surfaces in definite social-economic conditions and is the basis for the nationalist psychology. Artificially exaggerated notions and feelings about one's own social-ethnic community are often exploited for definite ideological and political aims in the interest of definite classes and social groups.

3. How the National Turns into Nationalist

The mechanism that turns the national into nationalist in the social psychology is based on two elementary integrals—predisposition and stereotype—and the process through which emotional reactions are directed on an object not causally related to the stimulant of these reactions. It is mostly used to cultivate ethnocentrism, accentuate ethnic prejudices, and stir up nationalist feeling.

Predisposition

In the most general sense "predisposition" stands for a psychic state of readiness to react to facts in a definite way. People react positively or negatively to everything that concerns them or affects their interests. Predisposition is an organising factor in the activity and behaviour of people at group and also individual levels. The main predispositions arise in the consciousness during the individual's early development.

The objects behind predispositions are different. Predispositions are related to things that surround and serve the individual in social practice, or to persons of the same social environment, or may be associated simultaneously with things and persons, or situations, ideas, processes and systems. Predispositions may also be related to social-economic communities with the members of which the bearer of the predisposition has not had direct personal dealings, or communities about which he knows from indirect experience (often distorted in transmission).

Structurally, a predisposition combines emotional and rational elements, with the emotional and sensual predominat-

ing. This explains its universality and why it originates so easily.

A predisposition is either positive or negative, never neutral. Its bearer accepts it as correct. All who do not share it with him are "aliens". In the case of predispositions related to his own ethnic community this leads to ethnocentrism. Negative predispositions towards "other" ethnic communities give rise to ethnic and national prejudices. But in both cases they are the mechanism that turns national psychological factors into sources of nationalism, its ideology, policy, and social practice.

Not many people realise that they have predispositions. Fewer still are aware of the influence predispositions exercise on their social behaviour. If a negative predisposition towards a social-ethnic community results from some factor in the individual's consciousness, information about members of that community is distorted in the individual's mind, his opinion is warped, and all his decisions or actions related to this community or its members will be unfavourable. Predispositions similar in orientation and intensity unite people on the basis of common likes or dislikes. The white minority in Rhodesia, for example, is welded together by a similar negative predisposition towards the people of Zimbabwe. And Africans in Guyana have a political party based on their common negative predisposition towards their compatriots of Indian origin.

During the early formative period of the personality, the structural components of a predisposition change quite easily under the effect of new experience. With the years its structure becomes hardened, especially in people encouraged over a long period by their environment to react to certain events or groups in a specific, "acceptable" manner.

Experiments have been made to determine the nature of predispositions and the approximate time of their appearance in the consciousness. Americans of different age groups were shown a picture of people in a New York subway car. It depicted two men—a Black and a white—conversing. The white

held a straight razor. The subjects were asked to describe the content of the picture to people who had not seen it. After recounting the episode five or six times, almost all white subjects over the age of 13 said the razor was held by the Black, whose behaviour was described as threatening the white. This misrepresentation was totally absent in the answers of children under 10. The whites' predisposition towards Blacks influenced their perception, mental process, memory and answer. Its inception in the consciousness was determined with fair accuracy at between 10 and 15 years of age¹.

Thus, an extraneous element enters the national—the attitude towards “others” and the opinion about “other” ethnic communities. It affects the attention, perception, attitude and behaviour of individuals towards other nationalities. A negative predisposition transforms the national element into nationalist, giving rise to national arrogance and a sense of superiority.

Predispositions are extensively used in bourgeois propaganda to shape negative attitude towards nations and nationalities, or to incite national strife. Western propaganda in October 1956 and the summer of 1968, for example, centred on creating negative predispositions towards Russians among Hungarians in the former case, and among Czechs and Slovaks in the latter. In the “cultural revolution” in China, too, deliberate use was made of this psychological mechanism.

Ethnic Stereotype

The second of the elementary psychological integrals used for cultivating nationalism is the stereotype: a stable, by origin emotional, hardened psychic factor reflecting some fairly complex fact. Stereotypes are sensually coloured social images constituting an accumulation of people's social and psychological experience of communication with each other.

The psychological mechanism of uncritical absorption, generating ethnic stereotypes in the consciousness, presup-

¹ O. Klineberg, *Social Psychology*, New York, 1954.

poses a possible difference in the quality of stereotypes. They may be more or less truthful or unrecognisably distorted, false reflections of the object. Measured by the criteria of scientific truth and logic, stereotypes are an exceedingly imperfect means of thinking. Yet they exist and are extensively used, though their users may not be conscious of them. Emotionally coloured images of people and phenomena are widespread and affect people's thinking, their attitudes and opinions.

Class, group, professional and age stereotypes, for example, are formed depending on the character of the object and its place in the social structure. National and ethnic groups, too, are often objects of stereotype. In their case the stereotypes are general and simplified images: some apparent physical feature (colour of skin, shape of eyes, mould of lips, type of hair, shape of head, height, and the like). Among the Chinese, for example, under the impact of official propaganda the ethnic genotype of the European has a "long nose". A stereotype may be based on some trait of behaviour (taciturnity, gesticulation, reserve, tightfistedness, and the like).

A national stereotype presupposes a definite feature in all members of an ethnic or national group. Ineluctably, such an undifferentiated judgement contains an overt or covert evaluation, which may be positive or negative. Acceptance of this evaluation makes the stereotype identical for all members of a group, and in certain conditions acceptance of a negative stereotype becomes a "sign of respectability".

Stereotypes are tenacious. In Italy, according to publicist Enzo Rava, Russians are invariably thought to be kind and selfless; this stereotype may be traced to Tolstoi and Dostoyevsky, and was confirmed by Russians in the Italian Resistance during the Second World War. This stereotype has not been eroded either by American films showing sombre, cruel Russians, or the bourgeois press which thrives on court reports about "Russian spies", or by trashy literature that usually casts Russians in anything but a heroic mould.

The implications of national stereotypes have been known a long time, and this, among other things, has made

them an instrument of politics. The nature of the stereotype, its quality, is largely determined by the social objectives of its bearers. National and ethnic stereotypes are sometimes a means of buttressing an existing order. Sometimes they become a means of protest against this order. Stereotypes arising in the relations between oppressor and oppressed nations serve political ends. The oppressor nation usually creates and spreads stereotypes of itself as more capable, more responsible, more efficient, more courageous, and more just. But it is not always possible to impose such a stereotype on the oppressed nation. The oppressed nation usually creates its own stereotype of its oppressor—a generalised image of cruel, merciless, arrogant, cunning and unjust people. Old Russian epics have brought down the stereotype of the "evil Tatar". Latvian and Estonian epics contain the stereotype of pitiless German barons. And in Byron's eastern poetry we find the stereotype of the "cruel Turk" conceived by the enslaved Greeks.

National and ethnic stereotypes are idealised in ideological works and fortified in social practice, and are used actively in this capacity by the ruling classes to maintain a relation of inequality between nations and nationalities. There once was the artificially created ethnic stereotype of benighted, backward, superstitious and submissive Africans. In fact, it survives in the minds of the average racist American, Rhodesian or South African. This stereotype had been necessary at one time to justify the slave trade and substantiate the white's "responsibility" for the destiny of millions of black-skinned people. Later, it became standard to justify colonial "protection" for alleged "humanitarian reasons". The "blond beast" stereotype became the cornerstone of Hitler's extreme chauvinism, befuddling the German burgher and cultivating national exclusiveness. The same purpose is served in modern America by the insistent cultivated stereotype of the "real American", who is a combination of "courageous" killer, hater of communism and sentimental paterfamilias.

Negative national stereotypes are still being created for foul political aims. Radio Free Europe, for example, does so

extensively in its broadcasts to the European socialist countries. Embellishing on the stereotype of "Russian assassin" used during the 1956 counter-revolution in Hungary, it has produced the "grasping Russian", blamed for all difficulties that may arise in the socialist states. And in the summer of 1968, having fallen into the hands of anti-socialist elements, the Czechoslovak press, radio and television created negative predispositions and stereotypes to plant mistrust and hostility towards the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

It goes without saying that the significance of stereotypes and their impact on the public mind, and consequently of the propaganda that creates them, should not be ignored, lest they become tools of anti-communist propaganda.

The Process of Projection

The psychological mechanism, whereby an emotional reaction is directed at an object not causally connected with the source of this reaction, is known as the process of projection. It is used to cultivate ethnocentrism, ethnic prejudice, and nationalist sentiment. Essentially, it amounts to a projection of emotions into another situation, where this is either safe or yields political profit. This is a subconscious defensive act of the mind, or a deliberate ploy to create a scapegoat for a setback or unfavourable situation. It is not necessarily an attribute of individual mental activity, and also occurs in collective psychic processes, affecting fairly large numbers of people.

On a large scale, projections may arise spontaneously. It has been observed, for example, that elections held soon after a drought or flood usually result in defeat for the ruling party, though it obviously bears no guilt for the lack or over-abundance of rain.

The mechanism of projection may also be used deliberately to deflect public anger to an object unrelated to the reasons or causes of this anger. Groups opposing the present leadership of the Communist Party of China, for example, were the object of an artificially deflected outburst of public anger in the so-called "cultural revolution" over the "great leap" policy. In June 1968, ingenious manipulation deflected

against the Communists the French people's discontent with the government's policy, and this affected the outcome of the National Assembly elections that followed soon after.

It is easy to use the projection mechanism against groups about which people already have fairly tenacious notions. In medieval Europe, for example, all calamities were ascribed to the Gypsies, known as "sorcerers" and "child thieves". In the latter half of the 19th century Negroes of Eastern and Central Africa believed that Europeans were cannibals.¹ The feudal chiefs fed this story to their subjects, and used it to explain the difficulties that arose in their relationship with colonialists and missionaries.

Deliberate use of the projection mechanism in national relations is also widespread in the present times. Equally negative notions about each other, implanted among the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus, enable imperialist propaganda to sustain tensions between the two communities by stoking nationalist sentiment and encouraging mutual dislike.

The mechanism of projection easily activates nationalist integrals. Economic difficulties in China, for example, spurred the artificial revival of ethnocentric notions in the public mind, projecting the mass discontent from the real culprits to an external "culprit"—the Soviet "revisionists". Similar manipulation could be observed in the content of Western radio broadcasts to Czechoslovakia in 1968 and 1969.

Better knowledge of the mechanism of projection will evidently help to devise effective counter-measures to such malicious actuation of nationalist psychology in the mass consciousness.

4. Manifestations of Nationalist Psychology in the Mass Consciousness

Mass nationalist psychology functions most frequently in the form of ethnic and national prejudices and nationalist sentiments. Each of these socio-psychological integrals

¹ H. C. Kelman (ed.), *International Behaviour. A Social-Psychological Analysis*, N. Y., 1965, p. 49.

influences public opinion concerning national and international values, and results in racial, national and ethnic discrimination, encouraging ethnocentrism and national egoism. Prejudice is a biased or hostile predisposition towards something in the absence of sufficient grounds or knowledge. In the case of national or ethnic groups prejudice is a biased or hostile attitude towards their members, and towards their activity, behaviour and social position.

**Ethnic
and National
Prejudices**

The decisive factor behind ethnic and national prejudices is the socio-economic inequality of different communities living within the same economic system. The material interest of one ethnic community, holding the commanding heights in the economy and consequently the state, in preserving conditions for cheaper and surer exploitation of members of another ethnic community, is one of the most obvious sources of prejudice. South Africa is a classic example. There the ethnic prejudices of the white minority are worked into the ideology of the state and fixed in the country's legislation and in the practice of apartheid. The ethnic prejudices against Indians among the white population of some Latin American countries are chiefly traceable, investigators hold, to the economic situation of the Indians, who have supplied cheap labour since the days of the Spanish conquistadores. Prejudices consolidate this pattern in the interest of the white population. Certainly, it is no mere coincidence that people with the greatest stake in cultivating and preserving that sort of prejudices are members of the propertied classes.

The connection between ethnic prejudices and the class nature of the existing economic relations is just as clear in all other cases. It is an established fact, for example, that on the West coast of the United States Asian immigrants had not been an object of ethnic prejudices and suffered no discrimination until they became so numerous as to compete with the whites on the labour market and in commerce. Americans of Japanese origin were not treated with hostility until their economic situation improved and they became competitive in

economic and cultural fields. And in the Middle West the attitude towards various national minorities still largely depends on the immigrants' willingness to accept lower wages, with Irishmen, Swedes and Italians being targets of national prejudice.

In an antagonistic society, the economic factor also gives rise to xenophobia—dislike of foreigners in general, a widespread form of ethnic and national prejudice. However, as a rule xenophobia does not spread to national and ethnic groups that do not invade the labour market as competitors. This may be seen from the example of those West European countries which import foreign workers on a large scale. Turks, Spaniards and Italians, employed in unattractive jobs in road-building and industrial construction in the Federal Republic of Germany, have not aroused open hostility, though a certain section of the local population regards them as "second-rate" people: it is not usual to live in the same house or to have friends among them.

Examining prejudices on the epistemological plane, we may note that they arise as the consequence of an incomplete or distorted knowledge of their object. Based on an imagined or assumed association, a predisposition with deficient cognitive content exercises a strong influence on the attitude of people, underlies decisions related to the object, and is reflected in behaviour towards that object. Prejudices arising from ignorance or incomplete knowledge may concern a wide range of objects: things, animals, people and their associations, ideas and notions, forms of social consciousness (e.g., science), and ideological systems (e.g., communism). But the most widespread type of prejudice is ethnic or national.

The part of ignorance in the genesis of ethnic and national prejudices has been shown in experiments, among which those of Eugene Hartley are probably the best known: he worked with groups of white American students from several US universities, who were asked about their attitude to members of 32 different nationalities, including three non-existent ones—Danerians, Pyrineans and Wallonians. Those who had slighted Chinese, Jews, Italians, Blacks, Norwegians and

Yugoslavs, saying they should not be allowed into the United States, also rejected these non-existent nationalities. By association with those towards whom these students already possessed prejudices, they instantly formed similar negative predispositions, though knowing nothing about these people.

The survival of ethnic and national prejudices is partly traceable to certain psychological factors that ultimately stem from social-economic conditions. One factor is the satisfaction obtained from a false sense of superiority by members of the ethnic majority on low rungs of the social ladder. Encouraged by the more prosperous members of the dominant nationality, and wishing to preserve a source of cheap labour, the poorest white farmers are the most virulent racists in the South of the United States. The extreme rightist politicians—proponents of segregation—get their biggest support usually in economically handicapped areas. People of a relatively low social position in the dominant ethnic group compensate their lack of real prestige with the illusory prestige of belonging to a “superior race”. This is exploited by reactionary organisations like the Ku-Klux-Klan, which recruit members among the lower petty-bourgeois and declassed elements, as well as the rich and the upper petty bourgeoisie.

Another reason for prejudices is conformism, which, if violated, results in social pressures, such as ostracism and boycotts. As a result, white miners in the South usually refuse to associate with their Black mates, except in the mine and at trade union meetings. At work their relations are friendly.

The ruling classes in antagonistic societies nurture and profit from ethnic and national prejudices. One of the oppressed groups is usually enlisted in police units to keep other oppressed groups in line. For this it gets a somewhat higher status, though it remains an object of exploitation. The British in India, for example, formed Sepoy units, and the Russian tsar had his “wild” divisions recruited among ethnic minorities. Some of the present-day African capitalist-oriented states recruit their policemen from one tribe. National and ethnic prejudices are also frequently used to split the labour movement by means of “national” trade unions and parties.

whose policy is based on mistrust of workers of another nationality. The Jewish Bund in old Russia was a glaring example.

Ethnic and national prejudices have far-reaching psychological consequences. To begin with, they distort their bearer's perception of people of another national or ethnic origin. The prejudiced eye sees only what it wants to see in members of another nationality, not what is really there. As a result, the extensive creative potential of the discriminated ethnic community is lost to society. In many cases prejudices prevented different sections of the labour movement from uniting, because one or another had a bias against "foreigners" and mistrusted their revolutionary potential. It requires special efforts by the Marxist parties to remedy this state of affairs.

People contaminated with ethnic and national prejudices experience a subconscious fear of the objects of their dislike. They regard discriminated people as a potential danger, and this gives rise to still greater mistrust, and undermines class unity. Take the labour movement in Australia, where members of certain nationalities are traditionally not admitted to trade unions and other labour organisations.¹ They are on the lowest rung of present-day Australian society—people of Slav origin and Greeks.

National and ethnic prejudices, and the accompanying discrimination and segregation, and denial of civil rights, ultimately distort the self-evaluation of the objects of prejudice. They get a sense of social inferiority, and as a reaction are ready to assert their personality by espousing nationalist ideologies, such as Negritude or indigenism, by joining movements like Back to Africa, Black Muslims, and Black Power. Often, they resort to violence unrelated to the aims of the class struggle and amounting merely to racial unrest. This obscures the class nature of racism and racial discrimination, and also the way of remedying the situation. Soviet scholar I. Kon wrote: "Ethnic prejudices are often a reaction to the upsurge of earlier discriminated minorities that no

¹ R. Ward, *The Australian Legend*, Melbourne, 1967, pp. 129-34.

longer wish to suffer their condition. Prejudiced feeling develops into reactionary ideological systems calculated to vindicate the 'historical' relationships."

In his first theoretical article substantiating the principles of proletarian internationalism, "The Festival of Nations in London", written in 1845, Frederick Engels referred to national prejudices as the social-psychological tokens of nationalism, and described them as dividing the workers of different countries. Engels regarded freedom from national prejudice as a crucial condition for the workers' international unity.

Nationalist Sentiments

Nationalist sentiments are fairly prominent in the overall balance of specific aspects of nationalist psychology. Their influence on people, their activity and behaviour, can be very great, if only because they usually take hold in large social groups.

Nationalist sentiments are a particular variety of object-oriented public feeling. Like sentiments in general, they are emotional in character, impulsive and dynamic. Sentiments are the most massive outgrowth of social psychology and a product of the refraction of economic relations both directly and indirectly through the prism of ideology and politics. "Alongside the economic factor and the material conditions of life," says B. D. Parygin, a Soviet researcher, "considerable influence on the sentiments of people is exercised by political struggle and the political organisation of society as spontaneous social-political actions and also as deliberately generated political acts." However, there is also a reverse relationship. Public sentiments influence the factors from which they originate—the economy, ideology and politics—through the state of mind of the people participating in economic relations and bearing an ideology.

Public sentiments are diverse. They differ in content, are optimistic or pessimistic, revolutionary or decadent, or are expressions of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, panic or determination. They are also distinguished by their orientation on a concrete object. Directed at an ethnic or national community

—one's own or foreign—and accompanied by a corresponding set of feelings, notions, stereotypes and predispositions, they become either nationalistic or patriotic, which are mutually exclusive qualities.

The impact of sentiments on social relations becomes greater with the numerical growth of the groups in which they prevail, and also if their intensiveness increases. Since national groups are usually numerous and feelings related to national values mostly very strong, nationalist sentiments are conspicuous in social processes.

The public mood is infectious. This applies especially to nationalist sentiments. Propelled by the social-psychological law of imitation, such sentiments tend to grip large masses of people of the same ethnic or national community. They spread swiftly, but recede slowly, and their abatement is usually accompanied by sudden recurrences triggered by seemingly insignificant reasons.

The interconnection between public sentiments and the factors giving rise to them, coupled with their tendency to recur, is extensively used in politics for progressive, as well as reactionary, aims.

This is particularly true in the case of the nationalist sentiments of oppressed nations, which include the element of discontent with the oppressors and in certain situations acquire the additional element of revolutionary determination. These sentiments are widely cultivated and used by leaders and ideologues of national liberation movements.

However, sentiments of discontent of any other origin may also be artificially directed towards nationalist and chauvinist ends. Goebbels' "Katyn" fraud was unmistakably an attempt to touch off anti-Russian sentiment among Poles, brutally oppressed though they were by German fascism. Western propaganda pursued the same aims by its interpretation of the reasons why the Warsaw uprising under Tadeusz Bór-Komorowski was defeated. Something similar occurred in Israel in the early sixties, when Zionists launched a chauvinist campaign against the Arab minority, laying the psychological ground for the 1967 aggression.

Any political crisis that energises the political activity of the masses, usually causes sharp oscillations of public, including nationalist, sentiment. The artificially contrived political crisis in the People's Republic of China, precipitated by the "proletarian cultural revolution", coupled with increased activity of the masses, generated nationalist sentiments, which were deliberately fanned by the Maoist leadership. They were accentuated by specially nourished feelings of Chinese national exclusiveness and a specially stimulated negative predisposition towards non-Chinese in general, and Soviet (Russian) "revisionists" in particular, intolerance of national minorities at home, and also of the peoples of neighbouring Mongolia and India. Such a state of crisis is, in effect, as L. I. Brezhnev put it, "the result of the nationalistic policy of the Chinese leadership and its rupture with the principles laid down by Lenin".¹

The influence of nationalist sentiments on society's political life should not be over-exaggerated, as existentialists do in respect of sentiments in general. But Soviet psychologist L. Voitlovsky is probably right when he says that "it is impossible to understand the *social connections* in their entirety without a knowledge of the laws governing oscillations of public and mass sentiments". This should be borne in mind when examining nationalist sentiments in the present-day world revolutionary movement.

**Nationalist
Psychology
and Propaganda**

The stability and long life of psychological constructions feeding ethnic, racial and national strife, their being handed down from generation to generation, and their influence on the thinking and behaviour of large masses of people, have been exploited by the ruling classes of all antagonistic societies. The patricians cultivated them among slaves and the plebs, and the feudal suzerains among their subjects. Apart from religious propaganda, the ideological spadework performed by the Catholic Church for the Crusades cultivated hatred of Saracens and Slavs.

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 292.

On becoming the ruling class, the bourgeoisie did not hesitate to use past political experience, and incited members of different nationalities and ethnic groups against each other in order to consolidate its class supremacy. It was able to improve on this experience thanks to the scientific research of its scholars. The surest way of dividing its main political antagonist, the proletariat, the bourgeoisie saw, was to camouflage its class interests as national interests, to arouse suspicion and discredit other peoples, encouraging national hostility and racial intolerance. For this purpose it used propaganda of national or ethnic exclusiveness and arrogance, stirred up national prejudices, formed new negative stereotypes of other peoples, and cultivated predispositions to a negative, openly hostile, covertly scornful or contemptuous attitude.

Making the most of the political experience it has gathered over the centuries, the bourgeoisie uses all available mass media to cultivate notions of national exclusiveness in its people, and kindles prejudice against all other nations. Capitalists benefit from provoking the British dockers, against the coloured workers from the West Indies, the French metalworkers against their Algerian and Moroccan workmates, and the Australian seamen against the so-called new Australians. Capitalists benefit by inflating the question of national languages—Hindi and Urdu in India and Pakistan, Singhalese and Tamil in Ceylon, English and French in Canada, French and Flemish in Belgium, etc. They bring the issue to a point of outright hostility, even mob riots.

Modern anti-communism, too, does not hesitate to exploit nationalism, which it sees as a means of dividing the socialist community. Ernst Majonica, an ideologue of West German imperialism, suggests capitalising on the feeling that accompanies nationalist action; an exponent of the idea of "national socialisms" in socialist countries, he holds that "the West must appeal to their national egoism". Small wonder, therefore, that his ideas were snatched up by reactionaries in the FRG and the USA, and employed extensively by imperialist propaganda agencies.

Regrettably, bourgeois propaganda of nationalist and chauvinist ideas merges objectively with the propaganda of national exclusiveness and fanaticism actively conducted by certain people who profess to be Communists. To use the apt phrase that Lenin used in reference to the parties of the Second International, these people accept internationalism in word and supplant it with petty-bourgeois nationalism in deed.

Peking's inexcusable forms of anti-Russian and anti-Soviet propaganda are all too well known. The chauvinist witches' Sabbath in Peking of the end of the sixties was accompanied by a reported assault on the traditional way of life of ethnic Mongolians, who were subjected to crude assimilation. The Mongolians' wish to keep their mother tongue was condemned as "revisionist", and the sole Mongolian in the Central Committee of the CP of China, the only non-Chinese on that body to represent 50 million people belonging to national minorities, was depicted in Chinese propaganda as a snake trembling before giants armed with tommy-guns and Mao's little red book. The convergence of peoples implicit in socialism, spelling an end to national and ethnic segregation, thus became its own opposite—forced assimilation, and artificial cultivation of a national and ethnic inferiority complex among non-Chinese citizens.

Knowing that national prejudices are widespread and catching, that the youth has a penchant for imitation, and that in some countries national discrimination is organised on a country-wide scale and encouraged by governments, Communists must develop new, more sophisticated forms of internationalist propaganda. It must abound in facts, and should be emotional in form and content. It must acquaint the masses with the culture and national physiognomy of other peoples. It must implant positive attitudinal predispositions towards national and ethnic groups that for reasons of history have become objects of discrimination.

The educational work conducted by Communist parties must demolish spurious ethnic and national stereotypes, which are the grist of ethnocentrism and nationalist sentiment. It

must fill in the blank spots in our knowledge of other peoples and thereby eliminate the cognitive basis for ethnic and national prejudices.

More than any other social phenomenon, present-day nationalism causes customs and traditions, as well as purely psychological factors—wishes and feelings, fear and suspicion, hatred and prejudice—to influence people's judgement of problems at all levels of international relations. Errors of judgement concerning the stability of national traditions and the national character, the character of nationalism, its spread and intensiveness, have, along with other factors, caused errors in evaluations and decisions by some Communist parties at crucial moments in their history. This is why thorough scientific studies have been made of the role of nationalism in general, and also of its psychological aspect, in the communist and working-class movement. The psychological constructions accompanying and feeding nationalism—nationalist prejudices and survivals of national strife—are described in the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a sphere in which "resistance to social progress may be most protracted and stubborn, bitter and insidious".

Part II
Nationalism
and the World Revolutionary
Movement

Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggle for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts. (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1973, p. 17.)

As long as national and state distinctions exist among peoples and countries—and these will continue to exist for a very long time to come, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world-wide scale—the unity of the international tactics of the communist working-class movement in all countries demands, not the elimination of variety or the suppression of national distinctions (which is a pipe dream at present), but the application of the *fundamental* principles of communism . . . which will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions. (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.)

CHAPTER VI

THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM AND NATIONALISM

In the first part of this book we have tried to define the place and role of the national factor as a substantive element in the life of society. We also examined the general premises for, and effects of, the national growing into nationalist. It is now logical, therefore, to look at the conditions in which the national may grow into nationalist in the main sections of the world revolutionary movement. In Chapter VI we shall deal with nationalist phenomena in the present-day socialist system, and how the Communist parties combat them.

Since the national element assumes specific features in each socio-economic formation, we must determine them before analysing the conditions, causes and place of nationalist phenomena in the socialist society.

Features of the National Element in Socialist Countries

The national element in socialist countries has a number of special features.

The *first* feature is the fundamental solution of the national question on a socialist basis in developed socialist societies, principally the Soviet Union. The socialist system is the first in history to assure real freedom, and social-economic and political equality for all nations, nationalities and ethnic groups. Once the national question is solved it ceases to be a political problem and the basis for the specific historical

content of the national element. Uppermost in the content of the national element in the mature socialist society are the friendship, cooperation and continuously perfected relations of equal socialist nations and nationalities, and their steady all-round development. In brief, the content of the national element in socialist society changes radically with the development and deepening of socialist reconstruction.

However, delays in solving the national question, excessive radicalism in the national policy, and inconsistency or departure from the principle of self-determination—as typical of Maoism—may revive nationalism or nationalist deviations in some socialist countries.

The *second feature* of the national element in the socialist environment is the transformation of bourgeois nations and pre-capitalist social-ethnic communities into socialist. This is a complex and multiform process, involving a radical restructuring of all the aspects of life, the social structure, and principally the elimination of exploiting classes in the social-ethnic communities.

V. I. Lenin pointed to the complexity, length, conflicting nature and multiplicity of the socialist transformation of nations and nationalities. "It is *impossible*," he wrote, "to abolish national (or any other political) oppression under capitalism, since this *requires* the abolition of classes, i.e., the introduction of socialism. But while being based on economics, socialism cannot be reduced to economics alone. A foundation—socialist production—is essential for the abolition of national oppression, but this foundation must *also* carry a democratically organised state, a democratic army, etc. By transforming capitalism into socialism the proletariat creates the *possibility* of abolishing national oppression; the possibility becomes reality 'only'—'only'!—with the establishment of full democracy in all spheres, including the delineation of state frontiers in accordance with the 'sympathies' of the population, including complete freedom to secede. And this, in turn, will serve as a basis for developing the *practical* elimination of even the slightest national friction and the least national

mistrust, for an accelerated drawing together and fusion of nations that will be completed when the state *withers away*.”¹

We know from past history that as pre-capitalist social-ethnic communities turned into bourgeois nations, the national grew due to class antagonisms into nationalist, resulting in different historical varieties of nationalism. In the course of socialist construction, with internal class antagonisms disappearing, there arises a new, qualitatively different and as yet insufficiently studied connection between national transformations and nationalist phenomena. In the more complex and deep-going process of the transformation of pre-capitalist social-economic communities and bourgeois nations into socialist there may also appear (given definite historical conditions, especially in the early stages) a side product: various nationalist phenomena and deviations. To describe these as mere survivals may be correct in a broad historical sense, but insufficient for effective counter-measures.

The *third feature* of the national element is that since socialism transcended the framework of one state and became a world system, its international character acquired new qualities. At present, relations between nations are maintained on a socialist basis not only within a single state, but also between different socialist countries. The essential point about these new inter-national relations is the absence of the class and national antagonisms implicit in pre-socialist formations.

The national relations between the peoples of different socialist countries are also extremely complex and multifold. This complexity derives, among other things, from the highly diverse social-ethnic composition (by demographic classification) of the socialist countries. With the emergence of the world socialist system, socialist countries of different national make-up entered into complex inter-national relationships, for some are multinational, others binational, and others un-national or close to un-national with a relatively considerable

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 325.

percentage of national minorities. All in all, the territory of the socialist countries is inhabited by something like 200 nations, nationalities and ethnic groups.

The Soviet Union with nearly 130 big and small peoples is an example of a multinational socialist state. Its large number of peoples is united in the framework of 15 Soviet socialist republics, 20 autonomous republics, 8 autonomous regions, and 10 national areas. Yugoslavia is another multinational socialist state, embracing the socialist republics of Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro, the autonomous province of Vojvodina and the autonomous region of Kosovo-Metohija, both of which enter Serbia.

Czechoslovakia is a binational state, the overwhelming majority of the population being Czech or Slovak. Poland, the German Democratic Republic, and the Korean People's Democratic Republic are uninational socialist states, while Hungary and Bulgaria are close to being uninational, but have a fairly considerable percentage of national minorities.

The complexity and novelty of the inter-national relations between socialist countries, and the extremely diverse social-ethnic composition of their population may be the cause of temporary contradictions. These may be distorted in the public consciousness and social practice, causing the national to grow into nationalist.

The *fourth feature* is national revival, the development and flowering of socialist nations and nationalities. The radical socialist economic, political and cultural reconstruction has had a most beneficial effect on the socialist social-ethnic communities. The economy is growing rapidly. The economic situation of nations is improving. National cultures are in bloom. All this is lifting the national spirit, national feelings, national pride and patriotism.

However, if the objective tendency towards the convergence of nations is underestimated or neglected there is always the danger that the perfectly justified feeling of national pride may, in the context of rapid national development,

grow into national arrogance. And that may lead to nationalistic effusions.

Those are the most important features of the present state of the national element in the socialist countries. Common for all the socialist countries, they do not rule out other concrete or particular aspects.

Why do we say that these essential features of the national element refer to socialist countries? Because, first of all, there all aspects of the national element have the same socialist content despite existing national-state disparities which will prevail for yet a long time.

The identical type of public ownership (of the means and implements of production) is the objective economic basis for the socialist content of the national element. It is socialist public ownership that rules out exploitation of one nation by another, and also national economic antagonisms between socialist countries.

Another objective point is the *fundamental kinship of their social structure*. The absence of antagonistic classes, the identity of the people's basic interests, a similar political pattern, with power vested in the working people headed by the working class, form the basis for national relations of a new type.

Besides, the socialist content of the national element derives from the objectively similar historical perspective of building socialism and communism. This gives rise to identical social ideals and aims consonant with the international mission of the working class.

The common content of the national element in the socialist countries also derives from the irreconcilable antithesis of world socialism and world imperialism. Objectively, this unites the socialist countries. Defence against imperialist designs, struggle against international imperialism, is one of the main national interests of any socialist nation.

The subjective factor, too, plays an important part. In contrast to the spontaneous shaping and development of the pre-socialist social-economic formations, all the elements of life in a socialist society are consciously patterned, patterned

for a purpose. The conscious activity of the people, directed by Communist parties, actuates the principles of socialist internationalism. The material results extend the objective basis for the common socialist content of the national element.

It is this conscious activity that forges bonds of friendship among the peoples, giving impulse to the convergence and fusion of nations.

Lenin stressed again and again that socialism promotes and greatly accelerates the drawing together and fusion of the nations.

Imperialist policy and propaganda, directed as it is against the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, lays special emphasis on all varieties of nationalism, encouraging its revival in various forms. As noted in the CC CPSU decision on preparations for the 50th anniversary of the formation of the USSR, the national question is one of the most virulent areas of struggle between capitalism and socialism.

**The National Element,
Developed Socialism,
and Anti-Communist
Speculation**

The 50th anniversary of the formation of the USSR, the country's successful growth in this half-century, has again shown that the Soviet solution of the national question is of historic and world-wide significance. And as was only to be expected, it precipitated a wave of anti-communist falsifications. Some of the old publications on national relations and the national policy of the USSR, GDR, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries were republished. Many new ones were written. All are filled with inventions and slander, alleging national inequality and discrimination.

Yet the socialist alternative to nationalism is absolutely clear. So clear that even anti-communist writers refer to the incompatibility of socialism and nationalism. However, in most cases the matter is reduced to the dilemma, "either socialism or nationalism", which the authors settle according to their own political inclinations and sympathies. Of late, lively interest has been shown in the historical perspective of

nationalism and its influence on the future of modern socialism and the revolutionary movements.

The hopes which anti-communist strategists pin on the "nationalist explosion" are presented in a variety of wrappings: the national question is depicted as everlasting and insoluble; modern history is defined as the "age of nationalism", and so on. Some maintain that nationalism is a natural and independent state which now dominates "as a movement and ideology", implying, of course, that it is edging out the political ideology of the working class, the doctrine of scientific socialism.¹

Some of these disquisitions have loud titles, such as "Nationalism—the Final Stage of Communism". There are books and articles professing to give an "objectively impartial" picture of the national problem and its outlook under socialism. Let us take a closer look at one such article in *Problems of Communism*, a notoriously anti-communist journal.² Zev Katz, author of the article, "Sociology in the Soviet Union", is associated with the Russian Research Center at Harvard University and the Institute of Soviet and East European Studies at Glasgow University, Scotland. The man, as we see, is an expert on "Russian affairs", which should add to our interest in his scientific revelations.

In the passage he entitled "Ethnic Relations", which Katz describes as "one of the touchiest problem areas facing Soviet policy-makers", he examines what he calls the "negative national attitudes". Quoting Soviet sociologists and putting his own constructions to their data, he claims "the existence of two types of nationalism" in the USSR. One is the traditional type of national prejudice resulting from lack of education, religious prejudice, and lack of inter-ethnic contacts. This type tends to be diminished as these conditions are overcome. The other is a "nationalism of a new type, which tends to be actually generated by the conditions of a mixed national environment, in which there is an intensification of competition

¹ Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, London, 1971.

² *Problems of Communism*, May-June 1971.

for prestigious jobs, etc." The author refers to the "revolutionary character" of these "findings", giving three reasons why they should be disturbing to the Soviet leaders. First, the "new nationalism" runs counter to "one of the basic assumptions of Soviet ideology", namely, that socialist progress automatically wipes out national prejudices of all kinds. The second reason, Katz claims, is that "it may seem to reward their socialist development effort and Russian investments of labor and capital in the non-Russian national areas with rank ingratitude". The third reason is the rapid population growth of the minority nationalities and the even quicker growth of their intelligentsias, which "must lead Soviet leaders to fear that their policies are strengthening precisely those elements most likely to develop the negative attitudes of the 'new nationalism'".

Such is Katz's view of the state and outlook of national relations in the Soviet Union. He observes casually that conflict is implicit in socialism, that in the multinational Soviet Union "relations involving the national minorities ... constitute one of the touchiest problem areas". These and other "revelations", spiced with references to Soviet sociologists, give the article a ring of objective impartiality. In fact, however, it is a typical product of objectivist juggling with facts to produce sensational judgements consistent with the author's anti-communist orientation. He quite obviously refused to reckon with the natural connection of facts and events, to probe the essence of their movement and the historical outlook of national relations. Yet the half-century of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deserves an objective student, because it presents a graphic picture of the socialist alternative to all the varieties and forms of present-day nationalism.

In October 1917 Lenin stressed that the national and agrarian questions were the questions of the day, and said they should be handled with scientific accuracy and political responsibility. His deeds were as true as his words, as may be seen from documents and acts of state written by him and constituting the basis of Soviet national policy.

The Decree on Peace, the first decree of the socialist government, gave legal force to the principle of self-determination of nations, including secession, the sovereign right of every nation to decide on the democratic principles and forms of its statehood. A series of subsequent legislative acts upheld the principle of the equality of big and small nations, abolished all claims of the Russian imperialists to ruling non-Russian nations and nationalities, and repealed all national and social privileges. Among these are the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia, the appeal to All the Working Moslems of Russia and the East, the Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited Peoples, the decrees on the self-determination of the Ukraine, Finland, Poland and Armenia, the special government decree On Rooting Out the Anti-Semitic Movement, and others.

The structural side of the statehood of the non-Russian peoples holds a special place in the Soviet Union's national policy. Nihilistic national views were rejected in sharp political and ideological confrontations. The policy of building sovereign national Soviet republics won the day. Yet Lenin tied up the future of the world's first socialist country and that of the small nations with politico-military and economic alliance of the Soviet republics—a federation of equal socialist states based on voluntary association, fraternal cooperation, and mutual assistance.

True, the revival and renewal of nations, their socialist reconstruction, the solution of the national question, and also the orientation in national relations, is a long and arduous historical process. This is why, at a time when Soviet power was still very young, Lenin advised to "study the specific features of the extremely difficult and new path to socialism, without concealing our mistakes and weaknesses".¹ Despite the difficulties, despite all the snags in implementing the Leninist national policy, its results are obvious: the union of equal Soviet republics has proved itself viable, is thriving and in full bloom. This is borne out by its historical achievements,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 249.

and especially its victorious stand against foreign interventionists and the fascist invasion. And precisely this free alliance, the development of the union of socialist nations and nationalities, our Leninist national policy and its international significance, came under attack by anti-Sovieteers, notably G. von Rauch, an FRG "Sovietologist", and R. Pipes, a Harvard University professor.¹

What is the present condition and the development trends of the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union? What is the relation between developed socialism and nationalism?

Changes in national relations, their trends and perspectives, must not be dealt with in isolation from the general development of the social structure. The social content of the relationship within and between nations hinges, first and foremost, on the economic and class structure of the society.

No one would argue, for example, that capitalism had not only consolidated nations, but had also in a certain way impelled integration of the population in nation-states. However, integration of a population consisting of one, let alone several, communities, tends, in antagonistic societies, to split along class lines into exploiters and exploited. And modern capitalism has, indeed, accentuated the incompatibility of the economic and cultural interests of the opposite classes within nations. It has created a class antithesis in the culture of every nation, and its policy is necessarily one of social and national discrimination.

Developed socialist society is different. The changes in its social structure work for social homogeneity. The classes and strata of socialist society tend to merge. The substantive distinctions between town and village, and between mental and physical labour, begin to fade.

The growth of the productive forces in agriculture, for example, the gradual conversion of farm labour into a variety

¹ G. von Rauch, *Von den baltischen Provinzen zu den baltischen Staaten*, Hamburg, 1971; R. Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union. Communism and Nationalism*, Cambridge, 1969.

of industrial labour, the cultural growth and changing way of life in rural areas, tend to alter the social make-up and psychology of the farmer. He acquires points of resemblance with the worker. A growing number of farmers become associated with machines and mechanisms. The educational standard of the rural population rises. Also, the percentage of farm workers in the overall structure of the working class becomes greater (18 per cent in 1940, and 30.8 per cent in 1970).

The changes in the kind of work people do, their changing place in the system of social production, the changes in the character of their work and their role in the social organisation of labour, and the convergence of the workers' labour with that of technicians and engineers—all this makes the structure of Soviet society more and more homogeneous. The same may, of course, also be said of what happens within each socialist nation.

But before this trend towards social homogeneity within nations and social-ethnic groups in our country could gain momentum, there had to be the long, persevering and patient job of weeding out the survivals and aftereffects of national oppression and colonial slavery, and in addition to this a hard fight against the pernicious legacies of the old system—the economic, political and cultural inequality of different peoples.

There was the further complication that the many peoples of old Russia were at widely ranging stages of social and economic development, from the tribal to the capitalist. More, a considerable part of the population—more than 25 million—were still bogged in utterly backward, pre-capitalist modes of production. There had to be effective aid over the long term by the Russian working class to help the backward peoples of the Union to rise economically and culturally. The alliance of formally backward peoples with more developed nations in a socialist state enabled each of the constituent republics to build a modern industry, mechanise farming, train national personnel, and surmount existing inequities by balancing out the economic and cultural

levels of all the nations. Socialist cooperation in production and the re-specialisation of the national economies of the constituent republics and autonomous regions gradually eliminated social inequality among nations, though historical distinctions still remain in both the economy and in culture.

But they certainly do not justify the fairly widespread anti-communist contention that the national question is hanging fire and that national antagonisms and national discrimination are racking the Soviet Union. It is entirely untrue that the economy of the Central Asian Soviet republics is "colonial in character" (as Geoffrey Wheeler, the British sociologist, alleges in his book, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*) or that the economic growth of the backward national ethnic areas is oriented on the interests of "the Soviet empire".

The report of L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, "The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics", presents undeniable proof that under developed socialism the national question inherited from the past antagonistic class society has been solved in its entirety and for good. Take some of the industrial and cultural indicators in the Central Asian republics. Since the Union was formed, the industrial production of Kazakhstan increased 600-fold, Tajikistan more than 500-fold, Kirghizia more than 400-fold, Uzbekistan nearly 240-fold, and Turkmenistan more than 130-fold. Kazakhstan and the Central Asian republics have, in effect, achieved 100 per cent literacy, with nearly half the population with a secondary or higher education. The same applies to all the former ethnic areas now comprising the voluntary union of socialist nations.

The single socialist material and technical basis extending to all the national republics does not mean that the unification was by fiat. Some of the socialist nations, like the Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Estonian and others, come from old nations with long histories. Others, like the Udmurt, Kazakh, Mari and Tajik, took shape through the consolidation of nationalities and tribes, bypassing capitalism or at least the phase of developed capitalism. And a number of socialist nationalities grew out of small tribes and peoples

that were still in the mire of antiquated clan relations (such Northern peoples as the Chukchis and Evenkis). Naturally, there are still differences between the development levels of their economy, culture and art and those of the developed socialist nations, which are at the peak of maturity as social-ethnic communities.

The most important result of the transformation of social-ethnic communities in the socialist environment is the elimination of antagonistic classes within them and, more, of the socio-economic and class roots for any hostility towards other nations. The national salvation or revival of the social-ethnic communities, their transformation along socialist lines, their rapid economic and cultural development, and the maximum results derived from their material and spiritual national potential, comprise the content of the trend we have come to know as the flowering of nations—one of the most progressive in national relations. It is the result of the orientation of national development in socialist conditions. No less progressive is the trend in the relations between social-ethnic communities within the multinational socialist state, and also with other socialist nations. It stems from the nature and essence of socialism, which, to quote Lenin, facilitates and gigantically accelerates the drawing together of nations.

The anti-communist press is fond of giving a distorted picture of these two trends. It presents them as mutually exclusive opposites, alleging insurmountable contradictions in the Marxist-Leninist theory of national relations under socialism. Yet there are enough examples to show that periods of rapid development in the history of individual peoples resulted not from isolation, or contraposition to other civilisations, but mainly from the acceptance, adaptation and wide use of the finest achievements of the material and spiritual culture of other peoples.

That, by and large, though upset by the egoistic class aims of the dominant social groups, was the natural way, in which earlier civilisations and cultures enriched each other. It is not surprising, therefore, that the international character of production and the increasing economic and political iden-

tity of the multinational Soviet people are also spurring internationalisation of culture and intensifying the convergence of Soviet nations.

**The Soviet
People:
A New Historical
Community**

Lenin's theory of the drawing together of nations during the building of socialism and communism has materialised in a new historical community of people: the Soviet people. Let us try

and clarify the content of this relatively new conception, especially since it is an object of anti-communist distortions.

To begin with, from the Marxist standpoint the conception "people" in antagonistic class societies does not identify with the conceptions "population" and "nation". The population includes all people living within a nation-state or regional boundaries irrespective of class, nationality, profession or religion. And sociologically, the conception "people", its content, is not identical to "population".

Scientific communism defines "people" as the sum-total of classes, social groups and individuals who by their material and cultural activity assure the progressive development of a society in any given historical period. In this sense, the parasitical exploiting classes, social groups and strata objectively holding up social progress, are an anti-people force and do not come under the same head.

The absence of antagonistic exploiting classes in Soviet society permits us to include in the concept Soviet people the population inhabiting the historical territory of the country. Understandably, a prominent place in the emergence of the Soviet people belongs to historical economic and cultural ties, and the identity of its history. But there are other criteria, and these are more substantial.

As a historically new community of people, the multinational Soviet people is distinguished by its social unity, which reposes on the identity and unity of its basic economic, political, national and ideological interests. Citizens of the Soviet Union are working people with equal rights, free from exploitation, bearers of the socialist material and cultural relations. Nationally, the Soviet people is a union of nations

and nationalities in a socialist state with unity and optimum harmony of international and national interests, of politically consolidated peoples, whose economic life is socialistically integrated. A common language of inter-ethnic communication facilitates mutual enrichment of their socialist cultures.

The foregoing permits of a tentative definition of this new social phenomenon, and of its place in history. The Soviet people is a new historical form of community shaping within the territorial boundaries of the Soviet Union on the basis of socialist relations of production, the socialist way of life, and the political, ideological, psychological and moral unity of its constituent classes and social groups, nations, nationalities and national minorities. This form of community is an important historical phase in the convergence of nations and elimination of class distinctions.

Theoretically, the Soviet people is a transitional historical form of social community. The internationalisation of material and spiritual life is part of the convergence and fusion of nations, and will give rise to new forms of social community in the future communist society. The passage to these new forms of community requires a radical reshaping on an international scale of each of the elements of the structure of socialist society. This involves not merely a repatterning of the class structure and the building of a classless society. Also to be radically altered are the state and national communities, which will in due course bring us to a classless, stateless, and nationless communist structure.

The objective trends in national relations show clearly that anti-communist distortions are doomed, and that the reactionary essence of nationalism is incompatible with social progress. An examination of the practice of present-day socialism yields several important conclusions.

Firstly, unlike capitalism, developed socialism has already proved that it is in principle possible to resolve the national question as a political question of eradicating national oppression and national discrimination, establishing equality and achieving a factual equality of socialist nations, nationalities and national minorities.

Secondly, the acquired experience of building socialism and communism confirms the interrelationship of the flowering and convergence of nations with the social-economic, class, political and cultural transformations along socialist lines.

Thirdly, the new form of social community of people, the Soviet people, produced by the practice of the world's first socialist country, shows in basic outline the possible forms and stages of the historical process of the convergence of nations that all humanity will go through in the future with but slight modifications.

Fourthly, humanity has been provided weighty arguments for choice: either a world of segregation and hostility among nations, of national oppression and discrimination, or the socialist alternative to the many varieties and forms of nationalism—fraternity, friendship, equality and mutual aid, irrespective of race and nationality.

Present-day socialism and the anti-imperialist liberation movement also expose the theoretical paucity and political reactionism of anti-communist speculation with the national question on the international scale.

**The Origin
of Nationalist
Deviations
and Departures
from Socialist
Internationalism**

Speaking at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, L. I. Brezhnev said: "The CPSU, which had to be the first to blaze the road to socialism, knows from its own experience that this is not an easy road. After all, this road involves

a fundamental break with many age-old traditions affecting the interests of all classes and social groups, the creation of an absolutely new type of social relations and the bringing up of people with a new psychology, a new world outlook. It involves, especially where relations between states are concerned, the surmounting of age-old national strife and distrust."¹ These points are not to be overlooked in examining the question of nationalist trends and deviations in socialist society.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 147.

The nationalist trends and deviations that occurred or exist in some of the socialist countries are generated by definite objective and subjective factors. As in the case of any other social phenomenon, there is a complex and conflicting intertwining of factors. And unless we bear in mind the dialectics of the objective and subjective, we shall never get to the root, the genesis, and the aspects of nationalist trends under socialism.

Exaggeration of the objective leads to bourgeois objectivism and the incorrect judgement that in socialist society as well nationalism is a natural effusion. In the long run this will lead us off the class road. Conversely, exaggeration of the subjective leads to a vulgarised, often subjectively idealistic, conceptualisation of nationalism. Too much emphasis will then fall on the volitional decisions and actions of political leaders. The methods of combating nationalist tendencies would then be subjectivistic and voluntarist. It is therefore essential in any scientific analysis to take thorough account of the dialectical interaction of the objective and subjective factors.

Now, a more detailed examination of the objective and subjective reasons why the national may grow into nationalist in the conditions of a socialist society.

The objective reasons behind nationalist deviations under socialism. It is not necessary for the purposes of this investigation to examine all the objective reasons behind the growth of the national into nationalist. We shall therefore confine ourselves to just the four main groups of these reasons.

The first group consists of objective reasons related to the historical differences in the social development of the present-day socialist countries. These arose long before the socialist revolution. The second group is related to the degree of maturity of the various socialist countries (or the world socialist system as a whole). The third group stems from the fact that remnants of the exploiting classes and petty-bourgeois strata continue to exist in socialist countries for a fairly long time after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. The fourth group

is connected with the existence of the capitalist world and its influences on the building of socialism and communism.

The first group. This could be conditionally termed the group of historical objective reasons. They derive from the specific development of social-ethnic communities in the past, pre-socialist, social-economic formations. And most conspicuous among them are the differences in the social-economic levels of the young socialist states, the result of the objective law of the uneven economic and political development under capitalism.

The socialist countries of today were, at the time socialist revolutions were performed in them, either agrarian, agrarian-industrial, or dependent semi-colonial countries. In other words, the degree of capitalist development there ranged from low to medium. The exceptions were Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, which had by then a high level of industry.

After the socialist revolution, each of these states had to eliminate disproportions in their economy and the level and distribution of the national productive forces, to assure more effective use of material resources, manpower, natural wealth, etc. In doing so, they put in motion the trend of balancing out the economic and social levels, a trend that emerges under socialism.

But elimination of disproportions inherited from capitalism may give rise to temporary contradictions, liable to surface specifically in inter-ethnic and inter-state relations. Though not antagonistic, they may revive old nationalist feelings and sentiments.

Furthermore, levelling out social-economic development is complicated by the fact that the countries of the socialist system began building socialism at different times. It is only gradually, through economic cooperation and economic alliance that the disparities are eliminated by patient harmonising of national and international interests. But this takes a relatively long time, and in the circumstances temporary disalignment of national economic interests may propel nationalist tendencies.

Differences in cultural levels, stemming from objective historical reasons, are also prominent among the historically objective causes of the national growing into nationalist under socialism. The past uneven social-economic and political development also affected culture. And the general socialist trend of balancing out all aspects of society cannot immediately eliminate the many cultural differences. The scale, depth, and rate of the cultural revolution, the development of culture, differ substantially from country to country. Yet differences are liable to generate national dislikes, arrogance or envy, and mistrust. National mistrust is something one has to reckon with when eliminating differences in cultural levels and surmounting the age-old cultural backwardness stemming from the preceding antagonistic formations. Local nationalism—one of the nationalist deviations in multinational states—arises mainly over questions of language and over attitudes to national culture, tradition, and history. This is borne out by the nationalist deviations once registered in the Soviet Union, and now in Yugoslavia. Especially conspicuous are they in present-day China.

Among the historical reasons are different traditions in material production, ways of life, general outlook, and the national liberation struggle. The conservatism and long life of these traditions is liable in certain conditions to keep alive former nationalist sentiments, even to revive them as nationalist deviations.

Historical reasons are also quite conspicuous, because in many of the present-day socialist countries peasants had been predominant, and petty-bourgeois strata large. "...The more backward the country," said Lenin, "the stronger is the hold of small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness."¹

So, the historical objective reasons behind nationalist deviations in present-day socialist countries are an aftermath

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

that exercises a visible influence on the present. But they are not the only explanation why nationalist deviations may occur in present-day socialist society.

The *second group* of objective reasons is related to the degree of maturity of socialist relations in individual countries and the system as a whole. The world socialist system is not immutable. It develops, going through definite historical periods, and becomes more and more mature. By virtue of the fact that socialist revolutions occurred at different times in different countries, with individual states gradually dropping away from the capitalist system, each country passes the various stages of development at different terms.

Some of the countries building socialism today are still in the transitional stage from capitalism to socialism. Others have built the foundation of socialism, and others still have mature socialism and are building the material and technical basis of communism. Each influences inter-national relations in its own way, chiefly depending on the degree of the maturity of socialism and the point to which the national question has been resolved.

A sharp class struggle is under way in countries still passing from capitalism to socialism, where the old social structure is being torn down. There are still class, and consequently national, antagonisms during this period, and phenomena of a nationalist order are liable to arise as the antagonisms are eliminated. What is more, due to the relative independence of the national element and nationalist tendencies, which often coagulate in the national psychology, practice, day-to-day life, and traditions, nationalist deviations may survive even after the transitional period.

Any inconsistency in resolving the national question at the beginning of the socialist revolution, however slight, keeps it alive in the course of the further building of socialism. In multinational or binational socialist countries delays in resolving the national question are liable to give rise to two main types of nationalist deviation: great-power chauvinism in the case of the more or somewhat more developed nations, and

local nationalism in the case of the less developed or small nations and nationalities.

But even if no nationalist deviations are evident in ideology and politics, inter-ethnic friction, mutual distrust and nationalist feelings are liable to arise all the same. It is evident from documents of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, for example, that complications in inter-ethnic relations resulted objectively in the country from delays in solving the national question.

To rectify past errors, the CP of Czechoslovakia had had to return to the national question and resolve it by restructuring the country along federative lines. Gustav Husák, the Party's General Secretary, observed on this score that "the experience of the national policy of the Soviet Union helped us to normalise relations between the Czech and Slovak peoples upon federative principles".

The maturity of the socialist community, which has its definite stages of development, also affects inter-ethnic and inter-state relations. Old economic ties have to be refashioned and new relations have to be forged between nations and states on the new socialist economic basis. The shaping of a world economy of the socialist type implies a new international division of labour and new types of cooperation and specialisation. This, too, being a long and conflicting process, may give rise to certain disparities and disproportions, and sometimes also temporary contradictions between the economic interests of the socialist community and the national economic interests of individual socialist countries.

Furthermore, these integrative processes also affect the national element of the social structure in each of the socialist countries. Not only does internationalisation speed up the approximation of economic and social levels; it also eliminates the former narrowness and separateness of individual nations, and diminishes the national and state distinctions between the socialist countries.

If we bear in mind that there is national revival in the socialist state, with bourgeois nationalities and nations changing into socialist, and with socialist nations reaching full

bloom, it should be clear to us that these processes may be reflected in a conflicting way in the consciousness of individuals. The age-old stereotypes, the traditional notions about members of other nations belonging to the socialist community, begin to break up. And this is sometimes a painful process. Distorted ideas are liable to appear about the correlation of the international and national in the development of one's own people and in its historical future.

Some people get wrong ideas about their national interests, exaggerate the idea of national sovereignty and contrast it incorrectly to the needs and interests of the world socialist system or the results of socialist integration. All this may incite nationalist feeling and breed nationalist conceptions.

Distortions of the dialectics of the national and international may also lead to nationalist deviations in ideology and politics.

A correct appreciation of this problem is reflected in the works of Marxist scholars. An article in the Rumanian journal *Lupta de Clasă*. "The National and International in Modern Social Development", says the problem of the correlation of the national and international, of internal and external factors, is acquiring special significance. We cannot but concur with its authors, Petre Constantin and Ion Florea, especially on the point that the national and international should be treated as a dialectical unity. They say Marxism has never identified the national with nationalist. The national, as they see it, stands for the sum-total of features materialising in the specific traits of a nation's political, economic, social and cultural life. Nationalism, on the other hand, stands for inequality between nations, for dissociation and opposition, for oppression of one nation by another, for the development of one country at the expense of another.

While concurring with the authors about the difference between the national and nationalist, we are, however, doubtful of their interpretation of the national and international as internal and external—national factors as internal and international as external. Is the international really only ex-

ternal in a country's development, and the national only internal?

Every socialist country is part of the world socialist system. The proletariat performs its historic international mission through its national contingents. Hence, socialist construction in any individual country, its gains and successes, are part of, and a concrete contribution to, the common international mission. For this reason alone it is hardly correct to define national as solely internal and international as solely external.

The standpoint of two other Rumanian authors, C. Vlad and N. Copoiu, in their article, "The Dialectics of the Correlation of the National and International in the Development of Socialist Countries", seems to be more solidly grounded.¹ They approach the problem from the standpoint of the general and particular, rather than the internal and external, maintaining that the international aspect is closely tied up with the national and that the general manifests itself through the particular in different concrete forms and ways. Though some of the conclusions in the article are open to question, the general approach, we should say, is correct.

The truly national is, indeed, also international. Frederick Engels observed, for example, that "in the working-class movement *genuinely* national ideas ... are always also *genuinely* international".²

Theoretically, there are three essential points in the development of the national: firstly, a particular national manner of carrying out the universal historical necessity; secondly, the specific contribution of the social-ethnic community to the world civilisation; thirdly, national assimilation of the progressive material and spiritual values of world culture. The international, which is general, is the most substantive portion of the national, which is particular. That is the true dialectics of the correlation of the national and international,

¹ See *Lupta de Clasă*, May 1972.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 374 (in Russian).

operating in specific ways depending on the concrete historical conditions.

The qualitatively new socialist content of the national element impels changes in the correlation of the national and international. Under capitalism, separate nations and nation-states were contrasted to each other, and class antagonisms often introduced antagonisms into the interpenetration of the international and national. In the socialist environment, on the other hand, the national and international tend increasingly to merge and coincide as the unity of the socialist world becomes closer. There is no antagonism between them. Antagonism is impossible. In the world socialist system, the international and national, though they do not completely coincide, comprise an organic unity. The international gradually permeates the national. And any violation of this correlation of the international and national may serve as a source and reason for nationalist deviations not only in theory, but also in practice.

The objective reasons behind the growth of the national into nationalist stemming from the relative immaturity of the world socialist system, have a different effect depending on the stage of its social-economic development. We might say in general terms that they are more active during its formation and early development, and fade away as the world socialist system, and each of its constituent countries, gain in maturity.

The *third group* of objective reasons revolves on the survival of some of the old social forces infected with bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism. Objectively, they are bearers of a nationalist psychology and ideology. They comprise, first of all, remnants of the deposed exploiting classes, small proprietors and petty-bourgeois producers, a section of the old bourgeois intelligentsia, and members of the old bourgeois political parties.

This group of reasons is historically temporary and disappears as the social class structure undergoes radical changes, and a socialist working class, a socialist peasantry and a socialist intelligentsia come into being. But as long as the old social groups and strata remain, nationalist prejudices

and convictions will survive, exercising a nationalist influence on the working people.

This applies first and foremost to countries which are passing from capitalism to socialism, when the question of "who beats whom" is still in the balance and the class struggle is still acute in all public spheres. Upon taking political power, the working class tackles the many unresolved class and national antagonisms, especially in economy and culture, generated by the previous formations. The continued existence of small-scale production and small and individual producers, coupled with the contradictory cultural influence of the old bourgeois intelligentsia, create fertile soil for the survival, even revival, of nationalist effusions.

The conversion of members of the old social strata into working members of socialist society is a relatively long and, indeed, arduous process that encompasses not only politics, economy and ideology, but also the way of life, the living conditions, habits, customs and traditions. For part of the petty-bourgeois strata and intelligentsia it is often an agonising thing. Describing the intelligentsia in capitalist society, Lenin wrote: "The transitory, unstable, contradictory position of that stratum of society now under discussion is reflected in the particularly widespread diffusion in its midst of hybrid, eclectic views, a farrago of contrasting principles and ideas, an urge to rise verbally to the higher spheres and to conceal the conflicts between the historical groups of the population with phrases—all of which Marx lashed with his sarcasm half a century ago."¹

This so aptly described nature of the bourgeois intelligentsia and middle strata survives until they become converted to socialism. This is why the "farrago of contrasting principles and ideas" (here a farrago of nationalism and internationalism) is observed most of all among the transitional and intermediate social strata.

The *fourth group* of objective reasons for the appearance of nationalist deviations and departures from socialist inter-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 202.

nationalism, is directly connected with the essential antithesis of the two social systems. The present-day capitalist world tries to impair the building of socialism and communism by its social practices, to obstruct or deform it (by economic blockade, imperialist economic and political integration, and the like).

Yet the main side of the contradiction in the irreconcilable struggle between capitalism and socialism is the socialist world, which exercises an ever increasing influence on present-day history. However, we must bear in mind that modern capitalism, though stripped of its historical initiative, still has a considerable influence on the course of the struggle. And it is doing all it can to disrupt the unity of the revolutionary forces, primarily the unity of world socialism.

Capitalism's objective spontaneous impact, too, is liable to aggravate certain contradictions within the world socialist system. This negative impact is all the greater as a result of the deliberate policy of international monopoly. By its efforts to isolate the socialist countries economically and socially, world capitalism tries to invade inter-state and inter-ethnic relations and prevent socialist unity from crystallising.

John C. Campbell admits in so many words that America's financial and economic policy towards Yugoslavia is directly dependent on the state of Soviet-Yugoslav relations, and is especially active when US leaders assume that Yugoslavia is moving closer to the USSR.

Reacting to the objective relationship between the two socio-political systems, world capitalism tries to stimulate nationalist sentiment in the socialist countries. Yet this sort of influence is a subjective rather than objective reason for the possible growth of the national into nationalist in the socialist world.

The subjective reasons for nationalist deviations under socialism may be classed in three groups. The first consists of those related to the penetration into the mass consciousness of certain elements of the psychology, ideology and political doctrines of the capitalist world. The second may be

traced to the survivals of nationalism at different levels of the social consciousness. And the third consists of distorted reflections of the difficulties and dialectical contradictions in the transformation of the structural elements of socialist society, including the national element.

The *first group* is well known and closely enough studied. The Communist parties in the socialist countries pay close attention to it and emphasise the incompatibility and essential antithesis of the capitalist and socialist ideologies. Fighting capitalist ideology as a whole, the Communist parties are, as a rule, clearly aware of the grave danger of bourgeois nationalism and its harmful effect on the working people.

It should be noted, however, that sometimes more attention is focussed on the influence of bourgeois nationalist ideology and politics than on the influence of bourgeois nationalism on the psychology of the masses. Yet bourgeois nationalism is exceedingly dangerous, because, while, as a rule, unable to directly penetrate the dominant Marxist-Leninist ideology, it revives nationalist prejudices and whips up nationalist sentiment in the public consciousness.

Furthermore, more attention is usually paid to the bourgeois nationalism of the dominant capitalist class than to petty-bourgeois nationalism and other historical varieties and forms of nationalism. Yet due to the fact that petty-bourgeois strata or their remnants are fairly extensively represented in some socialist countries, and the processes of the socialist transformation of nationalities into nations have not yet run their course, various forms of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois nationalism (Catholic, Islamic, Buddhist, Zionist, and the like) possess a social basis for growth.

The *second group* of subjective reasons, related to survivals of the past in the social consciousness, may also be conditionally termed as historical, encompassing remnants of nationalist feeling, sentiment, prejudice and certain elements of the bourgeois nationalist ideology bred in the preceding antagonistic social-economic formations. Despite the continuously shrinking social basis for their survival, they are exceedingly tenacious.

Emphasising this point, Lenin wrote: "These prejudices are bound to die out very slowly, for they can disappear only after imperialism and capitalism have disappeared in the advanced countries, and after the entire foundation of the backward countries' economic life has radically changed."¹

The tenacity of nationalist prejudices, feelings and sentiments, and of certain nationalist viewpoints, may be traced to the fact that they are kept alive, even consolidated, by the objectively existing traditions and the way of life. In certain social situations, especially critical ones, they tend to revive and grow. To be sure, national feeling (and not only nationalist) also revives in such situations. But the uncertainty and mobility of the demarcation line between the national and nationalist impels growth of the former into the latter.

It is safe to say that this group of subjective reasons loses force in the process of socialist reconstruction, particularly with the spread of the communist way of life.

The *third* subjective group encompasses distorted reflections of the difficulties and contradictions of reshaping the social structure of socialist society, including those involved in the transformation of the national element.

Practice shows that international experience in solving the national question holds a prominent place in this third group of reasons. Alongside the tremendous achievements there have also been failures and mistakes. And neglect (or uncritical acceptance) of negative, as well as positive, international experience leads to repetitions of the old mistakes, or to new ones, and may result in nationalist deviations.

The common principles of solving the national question take a concrete historical form in each country. Blind imitation and mechanical use of the experience of another country, say a multinational one, in a binational or uninational one, and the possible reaction to this mistake, may cause outbreaks of nationalist sentiment or a nationalist deviation.

But neglect of the common principles causes no less serious damage. Take the particular way in which the national

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

question was tackled in Yugoslavia. The authors of the book, *Topical Problems of the Reorganisation and Further Development of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia*, for example, reject centralised guidance of national reconstruction and overestimate the potential of a self-managing society of producers. They regard centralised guidance as the principal source of the nationalist—an untenable viewpoint.

Yet the authors admit that despite years of decentralisation, Yugoslavia will contend with outbreaks of nationalism for a long time to come. They admit, too, that for many years there was “a growth of nationalism in the leading political structures”.¹ Some of the recent decisions of the LCY point to the danger of nationalism and outline concrete measures of combating it.

The Second Conference of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in January 1972 recorded the fact that nationalism had become a common ideological and political platform of all opponents of the socialist system. Its Action Programme stressed that “even in the ranks of the LCY there has been a fairly large amount of opportunism concerning the sources, actions and bearers of nationalism”.²

Distorted theoretical summations of national experience in building socialism materialise in social-political conceptions of “national communism” and anti-Marxist “models” of socialism. As the example of the rightists in Czechoslovakia shows, these are faithful to internationalism in word only and scornful of it in deed. They claim to have creatively projected Marxist theory, but in fact tend to drift towards petty-bourgeois nationalist postures. In the end this results in renunciation and oblivion of Marxist principles and is liable to serve as a screen for anti-socialist forces.

The insufficient political, ideological and theoretical maturity of sections of the party and government cadres in some of the socialist countries, their lack of experience in practising socialist internationalism, also belong among the subjective

¹ *Aktuelni problemi reorganizacije i daljeg razvoja SKJ*, Belgrade, 1967, pp. 260-61.

² *Borba*, January 29, 1972.

reasons for the possible appearance of nationalist deviations. This is particularly true in cases where the principles of collective leadership and the democratic standards of inner-party and government life, are violated. As a rule, these distortions result in departures from the norms and principles of Marxist ideology, leading to great-power chauvinism or local nationalism.

A conciliatory attitude by the Communist Party, the leading political force in socialist countries, to nationalist deviations at home or on the international scene may also be classed as a subjective reason for possible nationalist phenomena. This is borne out by the example of the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

Communist parties that keep a close eye on possible nationalist tendencies and come to grips with them the moment they appear, prevent them from becoming a serious danger. But wherever nationalist tendencies are not combated and nationalist deviations are allowed to spread, let alone deliberately or unconsciously encouraged, there appear political trends based on narrow nationalism.

Political Affairs, the theoretical journal of the CPUSA, notes that the narrow nationalism of the Chinese Communist Party leadership is the very opposite of socialist internationalism. The leadership of the CPC, the article says, has repudiated the principles of socialist internationalism. It has come forward with the thesis that each country building socialism "must rely mainly on itself for construction". On the face of it, this sounds reasonable enough, but in fact it projects China's withdrawal from the ties of mutual assistance and cooperation prevailing within the community of socialist states.

The *Political Affairs* editorial notes that the principles of socialist internationalism are also rejected in the concepts of "neutrality" and "freedom from blocs". The tendency to go it alone is, in fact, a departure from proletarian internationalism.

The rapid spread of such nationalist tendencies among certain elements in Czechoslovakia's Communist Party and

government quarters, the journal further says, was not the least of the causes of the alarming developments in that country in 1968.¹

This was subsequently confirmed in the 1969 Documents of the CP of Czechoslovakia and in statements by its General Secretary, Gustav Husák. "Imperialist forces operating from abroad and anti-socialist and opportunist forces operating at home," Husák said, "tried in every way, under slogans of national freedom and sovereignty, not only to impair our internationalist ties and commitments, but also to subvert the leading role of the Communist Party in our society and the very foundations of socialist society in our country."²

There is yet another subjective reason liable to cause nationalist deviations in a socialist society: insufficient concern by the ruling Communist Party for the internationalist education of the people. Given the dominance of the socialist ideology, the nationalist danger can be effectively blocked by vigorous action against the survivals of nationalist psychology, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism, against possible nationalist tendencies and deviations arising during the building of socialism, and by diverse forms of internationalist education.

For the CPSU this is a constant object of concern. Its Leninist policy is aimed at the gradual convergence of nations, at increasing their mutual assistance in economic development, at broadening their mutual exchange of material and cultural achievements, and at surmounting recurrences of nationalism. The finest national traditions of each people, enriched with the new, socialist content, make a harmonious blend with internationalist features and traditions.

Internationalist education must encompass all sections and strata of the people: members of the youth league, the trade union organisations and, first and foremost, of the Communist Party itself. This is doubly important, because socialist re-

¹ *Political Affairs*, October 1968.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 412.

construction causes far-reaching changes in the structure of the working class, the farmers and the intelligentsia, broadening the social basis of the Communist Party.

Broadening the composition of the Communist Party is essentially a positive thing. But it may have some negative consequences. In some cases, especially after the socialist revolution and assumption of power, the Party absorbs politically unstepped, ideologically immature and non-proletarian elements. Such recruits lack a mature socialist outlook and are vulnerable to opportunist and bourgeois propaganda. This opens breaches within the Party for nationalist tendencies, even deviations.

A nationalist deviation does not stem from a single objective or subjective cause. It is propelled by the sum-total of causes, their interconnection and interaction. And every combination of objective and subjective causes breeds a special form of nationalism.

**Main Forms
of Nationalist
Deviations
Under Socialism**

In history's first experience of socialist reconstruction the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had to overcome two distinct departures from proletarian, socialist internationalism: great-power chauvinism and local nationalism. The Party's assault on Great Russian chauvinism, especially widespread in the early stages of the Soviet state, was uncompromising. No less consistently did the CPSU combat local nationalism in the Ukraine, Georgia and other national territories of the former tsarist empire. As the later experience of the socialist countries showed, each of these deviations could have grown into a nationalist deviation within the Communist Party.

While in a multinational state local nationalism is frequently a reaction to the great-power chauvinism of the most highly developed or formerly privileged nation, in a unia-national country it can in the present conditions grow into a nationalist deviation within the Communist Party in relation to other socialist states.

With the dictatorship of the proletariat victorious in a number of countries and with socialism's emergence on the

world scene, the two main forms of nationalist deviations have undergone various modifications and manifest themselves in different ways. They may, firstly, transcend the boundaries of a country and exercise a serious negative influence on internal socialist unity, thereby weakening the socialist community. Secondly, since the socialist countries are the shock force of the international communist movement, a nationalist deviation in one of the socialist states may have a negative effect on the world communist and working-class movement. Thirdly, nationalist deviations in the socialist countries are bound to have a negative impact on the course and outlook of national liberation movements.

The most widely known and highly negative nationalist tendencies in the socialist countries are those that have transcended the conception of nationalist deviation and become the accepted political course of Communist parties, resulting in renunciation of socialist internationalism. The most glaring example is the great-power-chauvinist political course of the Peking leaders, which illustrates the danger and harm of modern nationalism for the world revolutionary process.

Participants in the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties referred to the dangers and the harmful consequences of the chauvinist policy of China's present leaders. It was pointed out that "their stand, one of opportunism and bourgeois nationalism, is hostile to communism", that they are supporting and encouraging separatist nationalist tendencies and anti-Soviet sentiments, and engaging in hegemonic drives, following a great-power course in foreign policy.¹

We should bear in mind that the People's Republic of China is a multinational state, with more than 50 different nations, nationalities and ethnic groups. The most numerous is the Chinese nation, which comprises more than 90 per cent of the country's population.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 90.

But there are some 25 other nationalities of less than one million each, with the total number of people comprising the national minorities officially estimated at 45 million.

China's multinational nature and her status as a semi-colony until 1949, focussed the people's revolution on social and national liberation. And during the national liberation struggle the Communist Party of China did, in the main, act on the principles of proletarian internationalism in matters relating to the national question. This is recorded in a number of official documents. The Rules adopted by the 7th Congress of the Communist Party of China say that the CPC would fight "for a federative republic of new democracy constituting an independent, free, democratic, united and powerful alliance of all the revolutionary classes and a free union of all nationalities".

However, the right to self-determination and equality of the peoples of China was scuttled in 1949, and, according to the Constitution of 1954, China became a unitarian state. None but the Chinese nation was granted the right to national statehood. An outright revision of the Marxist-Leninist national teaching, a display of great-power aspirations, it became the beginning of a politico-ideological departure from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Denying self-determination to non-Chinese peoples, the Peking ideologues declare that historical conditions are lacking for it in China, or for a federative type of state. They say, for example, that "if we were to recognise the right of nations to self-determination, we should place a distance between ourselves and the popular masses of different nationalities, and should be traitors to their will and interests. . . ."

They qualify the demand for self-determination and federation as "counter-revolutionary" or "nationalist", undermining "the unity of the peoples of the country". In fact, however, in the absence of equality, with suppression of independence and denial of the right to self-determination to national minorities, coupled with their absorption and forcible assimilation, such "unity" is nothing but Han chau-

vinism in home policy. It is distinctly a rejection of socialist internationalism. And it may be proper here, therefore, to recall Lenin's words of 1916: "...It would be a betrayal of socialism to refuse to implement the self-determination of nations under socialism."¹

Since the end of the fifties the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China became increasingly hegemonic, expressive of chauvinist great-power pretensions to supremacy in the socialist world and the world revolutionary movement. At its root are chauvinist ideas about the exclusiveness and superiority of China and the Chinese, the idea that China has always been the centre of the world and has now become the centre of the revolutionary process.

The present Chinese leaders try to buttress their claim to leadership by proclaiming the national liberation movement (rather than world socialism and the working-class struggle against imperialism) the decisive force of our time. This is supplemented by a racist and nationalist conception of a special solidarity, or "blood fraternity", of the non-European peoples. Such nationalist tendencies, initially a departure from the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism, have grown into a direct departure from the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

To substantiate their special policy, the Peking ideologues construct new criteria of internationalism. Personifying all social processes within the country, they do the same with internationalism. The Chinese press is filled with such statements as, "he who is for Chairman Mao Tse-tung, is close to us; he who is against Chairman Mao, is our mortal enemy".

To illustrate other possible nationalist deviations in socialist countries, we must look briefly at local nationalist neutralism. In fact, the neutralist slogan is often a cover for isolation from the rest of the socialist countries, letting others bear the burden of resolving common problems.

As a result of isolation, of counterposing one's country to

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 321.

other countries, there may arise the inclination to "improve" relations with the capitalist West, involving an element of kowtowing. Nationalist neutralism is inevitably accompanied by a refusal to fulfil internationalist tasks and commitments, and by an exaggeration of falsely conceived national independence, evolving towards concessions to anti-socialist forces.

Political Affairs, the theoretical journal of the CPUSA, referred to demands for a policy of neutrality in Czechoslovakia some years ago as a typical example of local nationalist neutralism. The extent and meaning of these demands, it said, is evidenced, for example, by an article by one Osvald Machatka in *Literární listy* on June 13, 1968. The article eulogised Imre Nagy, engineer of Hungarian counter-revolution, as one who "was critical of totalitarian dictatorship and a forceful proponent of democratic and national socialism", and as one who believed "that non-participation in military blocs and neutrality were guarantees of independence". Correspondingly, the journal said, there were growing pressures for revision of the Warsaw Pact and for withdrawal from it. There were also demands that Czechoslovakia take its own stand, divergent from that of the socialist countries, towards the Israeli aggression, and calls to cease helping countries fighting for their freedom. In an interview with a France Press correspondent, for example, Jan Proházka said, "We are a small country. We must have a modest foreign policy conforming to our possibilities. I can't see why we should interfere in the affairs of Madagascar, Guatemala or Nigeria." Commenting, *Political Affairs* rightly concludes that by the same logic, one might add, "or Vietnam".¹

Like great-power chauvinism, local nationalist neutralism lays claim to a special place, opposes itself to the socialist community, and, reaching into ideology and politics, finally merges with the various forms of present-day opportunism.

¹ *Political Affairs*, October 1968, p. 6.

Anti-communists maintain that nationalism is in the essence of socialist society and will in due course explode it from within.

**Incompatibility
of Nationalism
and Socialist
Internationalism**

An anti-communist journal contends, for example, that sooner or later national varieties of the communist ideology are bound to lead to disintegration of the socialist camp and world communist movement. Another anti-communist publication says: "The process of ideological disintegration . . . would not end even if, against present probabilities, the two major protagonists were to compose their differences."¹

Arnold J. Toynbee, a prominent exponent of present-day bourgeois sociology, maintains that in our time nationalism "is the strongest ideology in the world" and that "Communism has now been worsted by nationalism".²

These contentions are groundless. Our analysis shows that most of the subjective and objective reasons liable to lead to nationalist deviations in socialist countries stem either from the legacy of pre-socialist socio-economic formations, or from the influence of the bourgeois world.

Some reasons, relating to certain aspects of socialist reconstruction, stem not from the essence of socialism, but from its historically unavoidable underdevelopment. Their impact is temporary. They are not connected with the nature of socialism, and are based on a few real but not essential alien elements of the concrete historical content of the social changes performed during the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. As the socialist changes become deeper, these elements will fall away, decreasing the chances for the appearance of nationalist deviations.

The real national interests of the socialist countries merge ever closer with the international interests and aims of the socialist community, the international working class, and the

¹ *Problems of Communism*, No. 2, 1964, p. 39.

² A. Toynbee, *The Impact of the Russian Revolution. 1917-1967*, London, 1967, pp. 5, 17.

working people of all countries. The new type of international relations—friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance—which embody the principles of socialist internationalism and evolve in the struggle against nationalist deviations, is making historically necessary headway. Anticipating their appearance, Lenin wrote: “To the old world, the world of national oppression, national bickering, and national isolation the workers counterpose a new world, a world of the unity of the working people of all nations, a world in which there is no place for any privileges or for the slightest degree of oppression of man by man.”¹

The general socialist content of the national element has an international tendency, carried forward by the contemporary working class. In the socialist countries the working class is not only the main productive force, but also the leading organiser of social production vested with political leadership. This is why the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary ideology of the working class, of which the principles of proletarian internationalism are a component, reigns supreme in socialist society. They express the aspiration of the workers of all nations and countries to fraternal solidarity, close unity, and political alliance to overthrow capitalism and build a socialist society.

Following the victory of the socialist revolution there is a further projection of the principles of proletarian internationalism in relations between independent socialist countries. Proletarian internationalism gains a new content, and as a result of socialist reconstruction acquires new qualities and becomes socialist internationalism.

The sameness of the basic class interests of the oppressed proletariat, the joint struggle by different national detachments of the proletariat against capitalist rule and for the victory of the socialist revolution, make up the social basis of proletarian internationalism. The social basis of socialist internationalism is the sameness of the basic social interests of the victorious working class, all working people, and the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 92.

struggle of different national detachments of the working class in the socialist countries for common interests.

Every departure from the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism entails grave consequences for the world communist movement. Karl Marx wrote that neglect of the fraternal alliance of the workers of different countries in the struggle for liberation is punished by common defeat of their divided efforts.

Since the principle of socialist internationalism expresses the interests of the working people of the socialist countries, the main contingent of the world communist and working-class movement in the struggle against world imperialism, it also expresses the essential class interests of the working people of the world. In this sense the socialist countries bear a tremendous historical responsibility for the future of the world socialist revolution, the future of humanity. This is why nationalist deviations and departures from proletarian and socialist internationalism, like those, say, of the Chinese leadership, are contrary to the essential class interests of the working people of the socialist countries and the rest of the world.

As stressed in the Theses of the CC CPSU on the Centenary of Lenin's Birth, "the interests of the working class oblige the Communists to fight both against underestimation of national features and against their exaggeration. In combating national-deviationism and great-power chauvinism, the CPSU is always guided by the fact that neither any form of nationalism nor national nihilism are compatible with socialism."

Summing up, we might emphasise the topicality, relevance and vitality of Lenin's ideas concerning the antithesis of proletarian internationalism and all forms of nationalism. Though only a temporary, outgoing historical variety of nationalism, nationalist deviations and departures from the principles of socialist internationalism are nonetheless a serious danger and considerable obstacle to the growth of world socialism. Combating it, we cannot afford therefore to rely on the spontaneous action of the objective law dis-

covered by Lenin that socialism will make all the economic, political and cultural thought of mankind completely international.

Only purposeful and effective action by Communist parties against all nationalist departures and deviations will eliminate them, ruling out nationalist tendencies and assuring socialist internationalism not only in ideology and politics, but also in the psychology of all working people, in the daily social practice of the socialist countries. "We were and remain irreconcilable to all signs of national strife, chauvinism and nationalism," said L. I. Brezhnev.

CHAPTER VII

NATIONALISM AND THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

The communist movement in the developed capitalist countries embodies the historical tendencies of the workers' struggle for radical economic change, broad democratisation, and socialism. And since the material and technical preconditions for radical social change have matured, and the perspective is entirely realistic, the imperialist bourgeoisie is trying frantically to disrupt and isolate the communist movement.

For this it hopes to benefit from nationalism, which the capitalist class has long used to implant hatred of other peoples and divert the masses from their class objectives.

Hoping to disarm the working class politically and ideologically, the capitalist class and its theorists are banking on age-old nationalist feelings that still survive among part of the workers.

In the capitalist world nationalism is one of the determining factors of state policy and social practice. It creates a specific climate, noticeably affecting the mentality and ideology of the working class. It is, therefore, highly important to study the influence of the national element and nationalism on the present-day anti-monopoly struggle of workers and progressives in the developed capitalist states.

The problem is a broad one. But we shall confine our examination to just a few forms of bourgeois nationalism and their influence on the working-class movement.

1. A Few Special Features of the National Element in Capitalist Countries, and Bourgeois Nationalism

The emergence and development of bourgeois nations is linked with changes in the economic and class structures, and the correlation of class forces. And changes in the place and social role of different forms of bourgeois nationalism are connected with changes in the concrete historical content of the national element.

In the era of anti-feudal movements, the rising capitalist class constituted itself as a national force. Lenin identified national ties as capitalist ties. In substance, the capitalist class played a progressive national role until it gained economic and political domination. Thereupon, the capitalists' place in the social structure changed. From a progressive force they turned increasingly into a force holding up social development. It was the working class that became the bearer of the true national interests.

But working for its selfish class aims, the capitalist class continued to claim the right to represent the entire nation. In some cases, this enabled it, and still does, to present its class aims as the aims of the entire nation. But whereas at the time of its growth the capitalist class had a stake in, and largely promoted, economic and political unity, the moment it secured power its ideology and policy was re-oriented on fanning national strife and goading peoples and ethnic groups against each other (in its own country as well) in order to consolidate its class rule.

The National Question in the Capitalist Environment

Capitalist society has given rise to two distinct tendencies in the national question—one arousing peoples to national life, spurring national movements and the appearance of nation-states, and the other breaking down national divisions and forging an international unity of capital. But neither has a historical future in the capitalist environment. Aspirations to statehood of many bourgeois nations are not consum-

mated, on the one hand, while on the other, the tendency definable as the objectively necessary elimination of national divisions gets too little scope despite the growth of economic integration. If some of the larger bourgeois nations did, in fact, consummate the tendency towards national statehood, this was mainly at the expense of smaller nations, whose national aspirations were either ignored or suppressed.

Experience shows that capitalism is incapable of fully resolving the national question. As Lenin said, it cannot eliminate national oppression. The exploitation and oppression of classes by other classes, coupled with the tendency towards uneven social development, directly influences inter-ethnic relations, creating and increasing the inequality between large and small nations, and nations with different economic, political and cultural levels. Objectively, the bourgeoisie, especially the imperialist bourgeoisie, cannot assure harmonious development even of the nation to which it belongs, let alone of subordinate and oppressed nations.

Capital is driven by an urge to grow. Its only stake in national development is that national boundaries keep out competitors and assure appropriation of surplus value. Yet large capital is cosmopolitan. In the imperialist epoch, a handful of bourgeois nations exploited the greater part of the world population, maintaining its pre-national social structure. In the colonies, their policy was directed at muting the tendencies towards national consolidation, at preserving tribal divisions, and driving one nationality against another.

That national problems cannot be harmoniously resolved in the capitalist environment is borne out, among other things, by the present intensification of the struggle for national rights of smaller peoples in the big capitalist states. Though their aspirations to national statehood were suppressed or muted for decades, nothing could eradicate or destroy them entirely.

Take the Scottish national movement in Britain. It has deep economic and social roots, and is now resurging. There

is a similar situation in Wales. Though a part of Britain, it has its own history, language and traditions. And it is also aspiring to self-rule, though less insistently than Scotland.

The situation in Northern Ireland is especially tense. There the struggle for national liberation has become identified with the drive for radical social solutions, since the national bourgeoisie have betrayed the people and "are identifying their interests with those of the imperialists".¹ This is just as James Connolly, the eminent Irish Socialist, had predicted. Only the working class—the "incorruptible inheritors of the fight for freedom in Ireland", he said, is able conclusively to resolve the problem of national independence.²

Hand in glove with British and other imperialists, the Irish capitalist class has played on religious feelings, making people confuse the struggle for the social and national rights of the working people with the religious quarrel between Protestants and Catholics. But nowadays it is far more difficult to dupe the people thanks to the stand of the working class. As Comrade Michael O'Riordan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland, said at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "in the Northern Ireland state there has been established the mass Civil Rights Movement which strives to unite the Catholic and Protestant peoples in the fight for democratic rights".³ The democratic standpoint on the Irish question of British progressives and the Communist Party is of great help to the working people of Ireland.

Inter-communal relations have sharply deteriorated in Belgium, whose population consists mainly of two ethnic groups—the Flemish and Walloon. Until the beginning of the 20th century the Flemish population were denied prac-

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 673.

² *Ibid.*, p. 674.

³ *Ibid.*

tically all civil rights. They got the worst jobs and the lowest wages. And though the people spoke Flemish, French was the language of the gentry and the bourgeois minority. The Flemish experienced all the vicissitudes of national discrimination. In the 50s and 60s of the 20th century inter-ethnic relations were extremely tense, causing a considerable loss of life in clashes with the Walloons.

Oppression of nation by nation in the capitalist environment, with no prospect of a solution of their contradictions, unavoidably generates nationalism in the oppressed nation. This nationalism of a small people fighting for its national rights has some democratic, though historically temporary, elements.

The Communist parties in countries where the national struggle of smaller peoples has become sharper, suggest realistic and effective solutions of the national question. The Communist Party of Belgium, for example, urges democratisation, federalist institutions, workers' control in the state and private sectors, and a popular referendum.

But while acknowledging the right of the Walloons and Flemish to settle their national problems independently, Belgian Communists lay the main emphasis on how this will affect the situation of the working class. Would Walloonism pave the way to victory against monopoly and for socialism? "We think it will not," say the Belgian Communists, "because there are sure to be important changes in Flanders—even earlier than we anticipate. . . . We must explore the Belgian nation's way to socialism more closely and give more scope to the particular and different conditions of the constituent national communities."¹

**The Cosmopolitanism
of Imperialist
Integration**

The economic integration of the developed West European capitalist countries, and the continued intertwining of the West European economy with that of the United States, are determinative for the national element in the highly developed capitalist lands.

¹ *Drapeau Rouge*, June 28, 1968.

Economic integration enables US capital to invade the West European economy. And it uses this opportunity not merely to consolidate itself economically in the Western part of the European continent, but also to tighten its political control, and undermine national sovereignty.

US penetration into the West European economy is detrimental to national interests. Nearly half the US investments in Europe are in the countries of the Common Market, which was originally intended to protect the national economic interests of its members. Americans were quicker than Europeans to grasp how to profit from the advantages of the Common Market, with the result that US penetration is costing the West European economy dearly.

The cosmopolitan idea of political unification is also contrary to the true national interests of the West European countries. As conceived by its protagonists, political integration would oppose the peoples of the capitalist countries of Western Europe to the socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and primarily to the Soviet Union.

"Western Europe should be an example of independence and self-assertion, adding to its fascination and attractiveness for the peoples of Eastern Europe, so that their aspirations to self-determination could develop into a general desire for a great political unity of all Europe,"¹ Franz Josef Strauss wrote on this score. He conceived European political integration mainly as working in the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The communist movement in the developed capitalist countries is firmly opposed to the reactionary idea of a West European supranational political community, directed primarily against the Soviet Union and the other European socialist countries.

¹ F. J. Strauss, *Entwurf für Europa*, Stuttgart, 1966, S. 9.

Though the idea of European integration is tending to spread, it has not superseded nationalism, or its class essence.

**Fascism Is
Bellicose
Nationalism**

Take the Federal Republic of Germany. It has a candidly nationalist national-democratic party closely connected with the right wing of the CDU/CSU. The aims of the self-styled national democrats are the same as those of German national socialism, revamped to suit the new historical conditions.

The West German "grand coalition" government noted in 1967 that the NDP, its programme and propaganda, were patterned along nazi lines, but modified in order to be more palatable (for example, they make no mention of German "racial superiority").

NDP "national" policy rests on political principles that closely resemble those of the national socialists: what the nazis called necessity for "living space" is now termed "recovery" of German "eastern lands". The NDP claims that the FRG represents the entire German nation, and insists on the validity of the Munich agreements in outright contempt of the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia and other countries.

The West German anti-fascist newspaper, *Die Tat*, published a selection of passages from the programme statements of the NDP and Hitler's national socialist party, which bear out the striking resemblance of their political aims and nationalist ideology. Here are a few samples:

"We demand territory and land in order to feed our people and resettle the surplus of our population" (Party Programme of the NSGWP, 1920). "Germany claims territories in which the German people had developed for centuries" (Basic Principles of the NDP, 1965).

"We demand uniting all Germans into a great Germany by virtue of the right to self-determination" (Party Programme of the NSGWP, 1920). "We want to rally all strength in order to awaken the Germans' will to self-determination" (Basic Principles of the NDP, 1965).

The "old" and "new" nazis are equally demagogical in trying to conceal their nationalist interests, which reflect the aims and aspirations of German monopoly capital, with references to the "interests" of the people, and the "entire nation".

The NDP worked assiduously to arouse the nationalist feelings of the West German working class. Its "manifesto" contains the demand "to protect the jobs of German workers against foreign manpower".¹ The then "führer" of the National Democrats, von Tadden, said "the long-term labour agreements with foreign workers create the danger that Germans may one day become unemployed, whereas foreigners will still be getting wages and bread in our country".²

Since the workers' class consciousness and socialist ideology are the main obstacles to the spread of nationalist ideology, the imperialist West German bourgeoisie is looking for new arguments to buttress the old story about the supra-class nature of the nation. Extensive use is made of the idea expounded by German philosopher Oswald Spengler in the 1920s that the nation as a whole is a class as a whole. It is projected in the theory of the "middle class" being the locus of national unity. By "middle class" are meant part of the working class and the middle strata. Special efforts are made to brainwash intellectuals, whose percentage in the population is rapidly rising as a consequence of the scientific and technological revolution.

West German monopoly ideologues want to conceal the class antagonisms within the German nation in the FRG. This end is also served by the claim that the FRG pursues the special aim of "making the Germans a nation of proprietors".³

Nationalism is clearly a conspicuous feature of the ide-

¹ *Der Spiegel*, No. 15, 1966, S. 44.

² *Ibid.*

³ E. Schmidt, A. Heinze, *Volksaktiendemokratie*, Berlin, 1967, S. 32.

ology of reaction in the FRG. But the far-reaching changes in the thinking and behaviour of large sections of West Germans, stimulated mainly by the positive changes in Europe's political climate as a result of the important foreign-policy actions of the socialist countries, have injected a new element in the political atmosphere in the FRG. The visible activation of the democratic forces during the campaign for the ratification of the "Eastern treaties" is an important factor limiting the spread of nationalism in the West German socio-political structure.

The change is largely due to the long and persevering efforts of the West German Communists. Expressing the true national interests of West Germany, the German Communist Party said in the *Theses* of the Düsseldorf GCP Congress of 1971 that "the interests of the working class require firm action against nationalism".¹ It was the national task of the working people, the *Theses* said, "to surmount the power of monopoly capital", describing this as "the decisive content of any truly national policy in the Federal Republic".²

Combating nationalism ranks among the prime objectives of the German Communist Party and it draws the attention of West German workers and progressives to the new refined methods of spreading and exploiting nationalism.

The ruling classes in the FRG use a cocktail of "old" and "new" nationalism to promote their expansionist aims and integrate the working class in the capitalist system. They portray aggressive imperialist aims as national interests, and the aspirations of big capital as those of the entire people. By so doing, the capitalist class expects to localise the social conflicts and divert the working class and other working people from the struggle for their own interests. "Nationalism," the Second Congress of the GCP noted,

¹ "Thesen des Düsseldorfer Parteitags der Deutschen Kommunistischen Partei". Herausgeber: Deutsche Kommunistische Partei—Partei-vorstand, Düsseldorf, 1971, S. 56.

² Ibid.

"was the ideology by which imperialism twice involved our people in disastrous world wars, bringing it to the brink of destruction. And after the Second World War nationalism was used by the ruling class to split Germany and engage in 'power politics'."¹

The new forms of nationalism, the West German Communists note, are part of the "strategy of adaptation" launched by influential capitalist quarters in the FRG. They are employed first and foremost in the sphere of relations between capitalist and socialist states through a gradual "recognition of realities".

The FRG imperialists exploit the nationalist idea of "German national unity" and special inner-German relations. In contrast, the GCP maintains that the working people of a part of the former German Reich have created their own socialist state, the German Democratic Republic, and that with the establishment of worker-peasant power and the building of a socialist society a socialist nation is evolving in the GDR. In the Federal Republic, on the other hand, the old class divisions of a bourgeois nation continue. The standpoint of the West German Communists, especially their view of the nationalist slogan of a "single German nation", is truly internationalist and in the real interests of the people of the FRG.

**Zionism, a Form
of Modern
Chauvinism**

Zionism is a reactionary nationalist movement which spread in the 20th century.

The Zionist doctrine, produced in the latter half of the 19th century by ideologues of the Jewish bourgeoisie, is a hodgepodge of Judaism, bourgeois philosophical conceptions, and petty-bourgeois socialism.

Curiously, Zionism is not pleased with the date of its birth. Its supporters expound the idea that Zionism, "the striving to create a Jewish state", is as old as the hills, because "for thousands of years Jews dreamed of returning to Zion". Any serious study will show, however, that Zionism

¹ Ibid.

does not express what the mass of Jews in different countries have always really wanted.

Take this fact: in the 8th century B.C. thousands of Hebrews were driven to Assyria, where they formed communities of the same class structure as those in the rest of the world. Two centuries later, following the Persian conquest of Babylon, they were permitted to return to Jerusalem. But the bulk did not go. Similar cases occurred in the Greek epoch and in the time of Roman rule. Long before the Romans destroyed Jerusalem, Jews dispersed and settled in the prosperous provinces of the Roman empire.

But assimilation did not suit the leaders of the Jewish communities. It would end their economic advantages. So they made the synagogue the main centre for the artificial preservation of closed Jewish communities. Judaism became an ideological tool.

The specific nature of its aims turned Judaism into a religion of intolerance. Designed to prevent assimilation with the surrounding social-ethnic environment, it worked to perpetuate the social pattern and way of life of Jewish communities.

The basic postulates of modern political Zionism were formulated by Theodor Herzl, an assimilated Austrian Jew. In his book, *A Jewish State* (1895), he said anti-semitism was inevitable until the Jews would have their own state as a haven from persecution.

This figured as the main objective at all Zionist congresses. The first congress, in 1897, said the purpose of Zionism was to secure a Jewish homeland guaranteed by international law on Israeli soil. Following the establishment of the state of Israel, the 23rd congress of the Zionist world organisation proclaimed the aims of its consolidation, the return of the "banished", and closer unity of the Jewish people. Since then the State of Israel has been declared the homeland of the world-wide "Jewish nation", of all Jews wherever they live.

Modern Zionism is the product of its time—the epoch of imperialism. It is expressive of the crisis of the Jewish bour-

geoisie, which is gradually assimilating, on the one hand, and dreads losing its positions, resists this, on the other. This explains the postulate of the alleged incompatibility of Jews and other nations, and the necessity of mass emigration to, and consolidation within, a Jewish state.

Not surprisingly, the State of Israel is an outpost of monopolistic colonial expansion and neo-colonialism.

Herzl and his supporters did not insist on the "land of their ancestors". Herzl spoke of "settling a people without a land in a land without a people". Argentina, for example, was just as acceptable to him as Palestine. At one time the British Government offered the Zionists territory in Kenya. Some Zionists suggested Cyprus, and there were many projects of settling on land neighbouring Palestine. In short, it was not a question of Zion, but of the far-reaching economic and political aims of the Jewish bourgeoisie.

These political aims are supported by the Zionist concepts of "the single world-wide Jewish nation", "ineluctable anti-semitism", and "the racial purity" of the Jews. All these ideas are connected, because to acknowledge anti-semitism as transient is tantamount to renouncing the idea of a "world-wide Jewish nation". In fact, however, anti-semitism is a product of the class struggle, used by the exploiting classes to divide the revolutionary forces. Paradoxically—and Zionist leaders admit it—anti-semitism is useful to Zionism. Herzl said, for example, that "anti-semitism, a powerful and rather subconscious force, will not harm the Jews. I regard it as useful for the development of the Jewish identity."

This betrays the anti-popular essence of Zionism, which is prepared to use even anti-semitism for its egoistic class aims. Seemingly, Herzl and his followers were not troubled over the fact that anti-semitism was paid for with the blood and suffering of the Jewish working people. Besides, it is not right to explain away all the Jews' troubles with anti-semitism, creating the impression of the Jews' alleged exclusiveness as a people perpetually persecuted and insulted. In

fact, the Jewish working people are in the same boat as the working people of all the countries in which they live. To say that a people, nationality or national group has suffered more than others throughout history is not only a deliberate distortion of the facts for lowly nationalist purposes, but also a racist and chauvinist pose. The Zionists are trying to keep Jews out of the struggle for democracy and social progress wherever they may live, and disseminate the idea of a mystical Jewish identity, higher and more important than any other social tie or relation.

The psychological aspects of Zionism, still not properly studied, are in some ways unique, related to the origin and correlation of the structural elements of Zionism as such. Nationalist psychology is usually a spontaneous, distorted reflection of the national element of the social structure, that is, the aggregate of relations shaping during the historical development of a social-ethnic community (gens, tribe, nationality, nation).

Though some elements of ethnic community exist among Jews by reason of historical origin, they certainly lack socio-economic community and a common social being. In that sense the Zionist psychology lacks an objective social and economic basis, and its elements, as a rule, evolve chiefly as a projection of the Zionist ideology. This should be remembered, since the slightest imbalance in assessing Zionism distorts the content and correlation of its structural elements and its real social purpose.

The facts show that in all respects—psychologically, ideologically, politically and socially—Zionism is one of the most reactionary forms of modern nationalism, amounting to outright chauvinism. Nationalism is always an inadequate and distorted reflection of reality and, accordingly, an egoistically limited, reactionary social phenomenon. In strictly scientific terms, it is true, there may be progressive features, in certain conditions, in the case of some elements of one or another variety or form of nationalism. But this is because of the class factor, not the ethnic or national factors. It depends on the class heading the national move-

ment, on its aims, and its methods of resolving social and national issues. The more progressive and determined the social group or class heading the social or national liberation movement, the more pronounced are the democratic elements of its ideological and political conceptions and social practice.

As distinct from some other varieties of modern nationalism, the concrete historical content of Zionism, like that of racism and nazism, lacks any hint of progressive democratic elements. This is due to the general orientation of the Zionist parties and organisations, the Zionists' terroristic acts and subversive activities, and the ideological and political position of Israel, where Zionism is the official ideology.

In fact, world Zionism's reactionary plans are concentrated in the ideology and policy of the State of Israel. Its militarists and political adventurers have been assigned three central tasks by the real bosses of the international Zionist concern: first, to make Israel strong enough forcibly to control or at least effectively influence the orientation of liberation movements in the Middle East and Africa; second, to further consolidate Israel as a centre of ideological and political influence, and if possible also of control, over the millions of Jewish citizens of other countries; third, to strengthen Israel as mediator and medium of neo-colonialist penetration into newly-free Asian and African countries.

The international monopolies, racist regimes, and reactionary organisations are helping Israel in this dangerous game, which may one day precipitate a broad military conflict.

Out of the many aspects of Israel's ideology and policy we are interested mainly in those showing the connection between Zionism and other varieties of modern nationalism. As we have said, Zionism has a stake in anti-semitism; but it also historically supports racism, provoking extremism in African, and especially Arab, nationalism.

Zionist rulers cultivate racist ideas about the Arab peoples. The Jewish state was founded under the slogans of

"Jewish labour", "Jewish land", "Jewish defence", which meant expulsion and discrimination of the local Arab population, and expropriation of its land and property. This was how Herzl's idea was put into practice. Speculating about the future of the indigenous Arab population of Palestine, he suggested that Arabs could be used as labourers (e.g., draining swamps), because, he said, they were immune to yellow fever. His successors among Israel's rulers follow a policy of genocide. Between 1947 and 1949 more than 700,000 Arabs were either forcibly driven out of the country or physically destroyed. The Tel-Aviv newspaper, *Haaretz*, admitted that "Israel's policy towards Arabs is comparable only to the policy of the United States towards Indians in the past century".

In defiance of the UN Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, Israel's rulers have followed an annexationist course for a quarter of a century. In a *Spiegel* interview (No. 5, 1969) Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, said that in the Middle East "the map will never again be what it was on June 4, 1967". Genocide and racial discrimination are practised against Arabs not only in the occupied territories, but also in Israel proper.

Not only Arabs, but also the darker-skinned Sephardim (Jews from African countries, nearly 60 per cent of Israel's population) are subjected to discrimination. The Zionist leaders regard Israel as a "Western" society and shy from the very idea of Levantine cultural influence. Disguising racial discrimination with the pretext of combating "Levantism" they oppose the internationalist tendency of the progressive revolutionary forces.

The latter have their traditions. Outstanding men of Jewish origin have left a visible mark on the history of liberation movements. Large masses of Jewish working people took an active part in them. Following the war, Arab and Jewish democrats in Palestine, and later Israel, fought hand in hand, especially at times of aggressive expansionism.

The numbers of the forces in Israel that oppose Zionist ideology and policy are growing all the time. The Communist Party of Israel, which has Arabs and Jews among its members, has always worked for Jewish-Arab fraternity, maintaining positions of principle on the Palestinian problem and the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Despite the chauvinism and racism rampant in the country, the Israeli Communists have advanced the slogan, "With the Arab peoples against imperialism, not with imperialism against the Arab peoples!", which is an unqualified act of political courage. The finest sons and daughters of Israel regard internationalism as part of their patriotism. For them the policy of the present government is not only anti-Arab, anti-communist and pro-imperialist, but also anti-national, imperiling the people of Israel and the future of the State of Israel.

In the light of the resolute world-wide, including UN, denunciations of such extreme forms of modern nationalism as racism and nazism, it is not difficult to predict the future of anti-semitism and Zionism. We are no prophets, but it is quite safe to say that soon anti-semitism and Zionism, these two extreme forms of modern nationalism related to the Jewish question, will be condemned not only by public opinion, but also by international law.

The proceedings of the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel contain a trenchant study of Zionism.

Firstly, in the capitalist countries the Zionist movement works hand in hand with the big bourgeoisie against the revolutionary working class, against communism, advocating segregation of Jewish workers from their class brothers and from the struggle to overthrow the capitalist system, the struggle for socialism.

Secondly, in the Middle East the Zionist movement has been a faithful imperialist ally since the time of Turkish rule through the period of British dominion, and until the present day. It has opposed the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, going against the national interests of the people of Israel.

Thirdly, in Israel the Zionist movement acts against the interests of the working people, seeking to isolate Jewish from Arab workers. It kindles suspicion and promotes chauvinism and national arrogance, and works against the liberation of the people of Israel from the chains of foreign capital and dependence on imperialism. Aided and abetted by imperialism, its policy is centred on territorial expansion.

Fourthly, Zionism is a tool of imperialism in its global struggle and its political and ideological subversion against the socialist countries.

**Nationalism
in the United
States**

Extreme and bellicose nationalism is widespread in the United States, the world's biggest imperialist country.

We know of the venomous flag-waving "patriotism" of such ultra-reactionary political organisations as the Ku-Klux-Klan and American Legion, the obscurantism of the McCarthy era, and the purging of "un-American" literature from school libraries.

As a rule, nationalism in the United States is identifiable with racism and anti-communism. Its bearers are carriers of political myths tying the future of the land to the American spirit or maintaining that the American is the prototype of the "superior being" of the future.

In the United States, nationalism is of specific forms fashioned by the country's specific historical development. Among its ingredients are an official optimism generated by dread of the oppressed national minorities, and attempts to reconcile the present racial intolerance with the liberal ideas of the early American settlers. Its main purpose, clearly, is to suppress the class consciousness of the masses and supplant it with a hodgepodge of pseudo-patriotic slogans, illusions about US democracy and the social demagoguery of the ruling elite.

Nationalism assumes the garb of so-called Americanism, based like any other nationalism on a distorted consciousness. Exploiting the American contribution made to civilisation, Americanism distorts the national features of the

American people, twisting them to suit the egoistic class aims of the big bourgeoisie. Exploiting such traits of the American character as self-assertion, business acumen, enterprise, and naive faith in equal opportunities, Americanism thrives on the national consciousness and contaminates it with notions rejecting the unity of mankind and asserting the superiority of white Americans. Real or false disparities of a psychological, historical or cultural nature are used deliberately to divide the working people of the United States and those of other countries.

The rise of nationalism in the United States followed a course that was in some ways distinctive, traceable to such specific features as the colonisation of North America by European settlers of mainly Anglo-Saxon and French origin, expulsion and elimination of Red Indians as natural communities, importation of slaves from Black Africa, and assimilation of immigrants. As a result, the nation consists mainly of people who originate from various European nations, united by the country's capitalist development. In this sense, they form a typically bourgeois nation.

Slavery was repealed more than a hundred years ago during the war between North and South. Equality of white and coloured was proclaimed. But the problem of Blacks has not been fully solved yet. The black population and other national minorities are still fighting for equality and civil rights, against segregation, discrimination, chauvinism and racism, which, as the new programme of the CPUSA (May 1970) points out, are being used along with anti-communism as an ideological cover for aggressive, anti-popular imperialist aims.

National chauvinism and racism, befogging the consciousness of Americans, are used extensively in US domestic policy. White racism, the new CPUSA programme notes, "is fostered to maintain and aggravate disunity between white and black Americans". White racism is not just an ideology and policy of the extreme right and of fascist-type organisations (like the Birch Society, the Ku-Klux-Klan, the

Zionists, and Minutemen). It is sustained by the social practice of black and white inequality in the economy, education, the services, and the way of life. What is more dangerous still, it is adroitly implanted in the psychology of the white population. The old divide-and-rule principle motivates the classification of people by race, nationality or religion. There is a carefully thought out policy regarding entrance visas, job opportunities, professionalisation, and the like. As a result, the class antagonisms are superseded by national antagonisms, which depress the revolutionary potential, because, as Marx pointed out in *Capital*, the labour of whites cannot be free as long as black labour is unfree.

The CPUSA has taken a firm stand against the American variant of nationalism in its new programme. "Like other Americans," it says, "we Communists take pride in the genius and skill of our country's workers, farmers and scientists, who have created the world's most productive industry, the most bountiful agriculture. We take pride in our nation's democratic and revolutionary heritage, created by the struggles of our people."¹ But this legitimate pride is combined with a strong denunciation of the brutal racial oppression of tens of millions of people, the practices of political assassination, arson and bombing employed for its ends by the racist right.

Reactionaries invented and maintain the ideological myth of white supremacy that dominates the thinking of many white Americans vis-à-vis the twenty million Afro-Americans, the eight million Chicanos, more than one million Puerto Ricans, and the surviving Indians.

Zionism and its other side, anti-semitism, are a special form of chauvinism. There are 6 million Jews in the United States, most of them factory workers. There is a distinct element of anti-semitism in the restrictions on entry into

¹ *New Program of the Communist Party USA*, New York, 1970, p. 7.

the country, and discrimination in employment, residence, and other fields.

The ethnic minorities' just struggle against national inequality, white racism and chauvinism, is sometimes accompanied by a reverse reaction—"black" or "coloured" nationalism, which is a distortion of the truly revolutionary struggle for social equality. The CPUSA demands that all racism, including anti-semitism, should be officially outlawed. The national aspect of social relations in the developed countries of the capitalist world shows how numerous the channels are by which the nationalist psychology and ideology cultivated by the ruling capitalist class is spread in the labour movement.

2. Nationalist Tendencies and the Struggle Against Them in the Communist Movement of Developed Capitalist Countries

Objectively, the influence of the environment in which the capitalist class dominates the economy and the political scene, in which its nationalist ideology and policy gains ascendancy, is the main source of the nationalist tendencies surfacing in the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries.

Some of the Reasons for Nationalism in the Communist Movement

Nationalism is solidly rooted in the social practice of the capitalist states, where nationalist psychology is sustained and encouraged by the system of government and the traditions and way of life shaped under the influence of the bourgeoisie. The social crisis precipitated by the Second World War strengthened nationalism among large sections of the population. The post-war changes of state frontiers, too, were used by the ruling capitalist class to propagate nationalism.

Through the immediate environment elements of nationalist psychology and ideology reach the working class and

its revolutionary parties. Even in countries where the proletariat comprises the majority of the nation, the proletarianisation of the middle strata—notably the white-collar workers and technicians—will for some time to come introduce petty-bourgeois psychology and ideology into its midst.

The disintegration of the colonial system is exploited by the capitalist class to arouse in some people a sense of loss and prejudice against the peoples of the newly-independent states. Such feelings create fertile soil for racist ideology and great-power chauvinism.

In developed capitalist countries, nationalist tendencies may also arise in the ranks of Communist parties due to the insufficient theoretical or political maturity of some of their leaders.

Revisionist and opportunist departures from Marxism lead directly into the morass of nationalism. Opportunism, aimed chiefly at reconciling hostile classes and concealing the antithesis of their interests, thereby to subordinate the working class to the bourgeoisie, leads away from proletarian internationalism in practice, as well as theory.

**Interpreting
the Independence
of Communist
Parties**

One of the manifestations of nationalism in some of the Communist parties in developed capitalist countries, the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties noted, is

an incorrect understanding of the dialectics of the national and international.

To be sure, the principle of harmonising national and international interests is accepted as correct by the entire world communist and working-class movement. "But correct principles," Comrade Dominique Urbany, Chairman of the CP of Luxembourg, said at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "may be incorrectly used. For example, a Party breaks away from the world communist movement if the principle of independence is wrongly interpreted or overly and one-sidedly emphasised, if that principle is accentuated to the exclusion of others, while the principle of international solidarity is obscured;

or if it serves merely as camouflage for revisionist distortions of Marxism-Leninism."¹

The communist movement is profoundly international in content and its class nature. Marx always stressed that "the emancipation of labour is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists".²

Lenin emphasised that the struggle of the working class in each country is part of the world revolutionary process. In April 1917, when the Bolshevik Party set the sights on socialist revolution, Lenin told the Russian Communists that the revolutionary proletariat of any country is deeply committed to its internationalist duty. "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism," he pointed out, "and that is—working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle*, this, *and only this*, line, in *every* country without exception."³

It follows that the interests of international cooperation and joint action should not be neglected on the plea of national specifics or particular national aims. The essence of proletarian internationalism is expressed in the policy and practice of the working class and its parties, only in that which combines the national and international. Opposing the two leads to nationalism.

The Marxist-Leninist view of internationalism implies the right of each party to deal independently with its problems, to be independent in its decisions. But over-emphasis of independence in contrast to the unity and community of Communist parties, is incompatible with proletarian internationalism. This was stressed in *Rinascita*, the Italian Communist weekly, by Comrade Luigi Longo, former General

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, pp. 502-03.

² *The General Council of the First International 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1974, p. 288.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75.

Secretary of the ICP: "The requirements of independence cannot and on no account should obscure the main requirement of international proletarian solidarity, in the absence of which the communist movement would drop to the level of Social-Democracy."¹

A correct understanding of independence implies that each Communist party has close connections with other Communist parties. This is a natural element of the communist movement, which is an international movement.

The Hungarian events of 1956 and the struggle against the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia affected the entire world communist movement. And is there any Communist party that is unaffected by the processes in China? The same may be said about the impact of the successes or setbacks of the two most influential Communist parties in Western Europe, the Italian and the French, on the other Communist parties and the working-class movement of that part of the continent. The activity of any Communist party is bound to have an international impact. This is why it is important to see and understand the correlation between genuine independence and an inflated independence that becomes an aim in itself.

El Siglo, the newspaper of the Chilean CP, put the matter very aptly. "Independence," it said, "is a necessity stemming from the development of the concrete national situation of each party. In the absence of such independence the parties would be unable to fulfil their mission of uniting and organising the broad masses in order to follow the path of revolution to its victory." But independence must not be turned into an absolute, and, certainly, does not rule out the movement's unity at the international level. "Internationalism," *El Siglo* said, "is the main principle of communism. Any weakening of this principle in practice harms the movement in general and each party in particular."

"The fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism, 'Workers of the World, Unite!'," is based on the premise that

¹ *Rinascita*, October 20, 1967.

each Party bears responsibility to the working class and people of its own country and, at the same time, on an international scale, to the entire world communist movement,"¹ Comrade Max Reimann said at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

If this is incorrectly understood there may be a tendency to sidestep participation in major international decisions, to take a separatist posture, entirely avoid issues of an international nature. And that is very close to an extreme interpretation of independence. Those who take this position think they display "independence" by turning their backs on the world communist movement or by opposing the Soviet Union, the socialist community and Communist parties of other countries.

"Such a position may yield some temporary advantages," Comrade Ville Pessi wrote, "but so far none who really aspired to socialism has gained lasting success by withdrawing into a national shell, because the very idea of socialism is universal and international, and because in the present epoch of world-wide passage from capitalism to socialism in the conditions of scientific and technological revolution and the sharper international class struggle, national isolation becomes anti-national."²

The trend to exaggerate national interests referred to by many participants of the 1969 International Meeting, may be partly traced to the fact that for many years, during the period of the Communist International and even after the Second World War, some Communist parties in the capitalist world neglected those aspects of activity that make a Communist party a genuinely national force. Their programmes and tactical guidelines were schematic and overlooked the national features of their respective countries. Their membership was not numerous enough, and looking for an approach to the masses, their leaders misinterpreted

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 181.

² *Kansan Uutiset*, April 21-22, 1968.

the national element in their party's activity, and opposed it to internationalism and the interests of the communist movement.

None will deny that a Communist party is responsible first and foremost to the working people of its own country. Though international in scale and substance, the communist movement grows upon national soil. Activity within the country and close bonds with the people is the key to success on the international, as well as national scale. "*We do not separate the national and the international aspects of the class struggle,*" Comrade Waldeck Rochet emphasised at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "*nor our Party's national responsibility and its international duty.*"¹

If a party builds its policy exclusively on the concrete situation at home, it is bound to drift away from the common revolutionary struggle against imperialism on the world scale. Yet its success depends on the outcome of that struggle, while isolation will depreciate its chances. This is exactly what happens when some leaders confine the activity of their parties exclusively to their countries, ignoring international commitments.

**Separatism
Is a Form
of Nationalism**

The history of the working-class movement has proved that isolation is damaging. Yet there are still theories trying to vindicate division, and Com-

rade Gus Hall emphasised their danger at the 1969 International Meeting by stressing that theories vindicating division "appear in exact ratio to opposition to working-class internationalism".²

The progress of the communist and working-class movement would doubtless have been greater if some parties had not deviated from the joint struggle for the common interests of the international working class. Separatism is a

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 114.

² *Ibid.*, p. 437.

departure from the principles of proletarian internationalism, evasion of joint action, and depreciation of the experience of other parties.

The Communist Party of the Netherlands has provided many samples of separatism, over-stressing autonomy and viewing its internationalist duty as secondary, subordinate, often opposite, to its national objectives. The bourgeois *Elseviers*, a widely-read Dutch weekly, noted that Paul de Groot's position was unique among Western Communist leaders, ignoring the international struggle of the other parties and focussing exclusively on internal matters.

The CPN has, in fact, rejected cooperation with other Communist parties. At the Brussels meeting of West European Communist parties (June 1965), its stand was negative all the way. It would not participate in the Karlovy Vary Conference of European Communist Parties (April 1967), nor in the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow. And many Dutch Communists are aware that this is not normal.

Practice has shown that separatism is untenable. The effect of separation from other Communist and Workers' parties is debilitating for the party concerned. The posture of nationalist exclusiveness denies the party the opportunity for combating bourgeois nationalism in its own country.

**From Nationalism to
Social-Chauvinism**

The Communist and Workers' parties stress the danger of departing from the principles of proletarian internationalism, tantamount to drifting towards national-chauvinism. Take the candidly chauvinist position of the Mikunis-Sneh group during the July 1967 war in the Middle East. The differences between the CP of Israel and the Mikunis-Sneh group, which styles itself "communist", were ultimately the same as the differences with the Israeli government. In fact, the Mikunis-Sneh group is guided not by Marxism-Leninism, but by the Zionist ideology, which it zealously propagates not only in Israel, but also abroad. It supports the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries.

The 16th Plenary Meeting of the CPI Central Committee in June 1967 ruled that the Mikunis-Sneh group could no longer be considered either left or Communist or democratic. And the group's ideological downfall is clear evidence that subordination of class interests to nationalism leads to a blind alley. The group's chauvinist line brought about a split in the CP of Israel at a time when unity was most essential.

This example shows, too, that even in conditions favourable for nationalism, it will no longer come out on top if properly combated. Israel's true Communists have stood the test.

**Opposing Interests
of One's Own
Party to the Unity
of the World
Communist Movement**

Speaking at the 1969 International Meeting, Comrade Knud Jespersen, Chairman of the CP of Denmark, called attention to the imperialist propaganda efforts of obscuring the significance for the world revolutionary process of the growth of the socialist world, especially the Soviet Union.

"And," he said, "it has achieved definite results among certain left trends which, incidentally, owe their very origins to the existence of the socialist camp. . . .

"Consequently, explaining and highlighting the decisive role of the socialist world is a priority task for the communist movement, and its accomplishment is in the interests of all components of the anti-imperialist struggle. Needless to say, this applies above all to the role of the main force of the socialist camp, the Soviet Union."¹

Hostility towards the Soviet Union and the CPSU, groundless criticism of Soviet home and foreign policy, is indeed a specific feature of the nationalism that has surfaced in some Communist parties of the developed capitalist world. *The Thirties*, a book by Paul de Groot, former chairman of the Communist Party of the Netherlands, is a typical example. He offers an obviously slanted assessment of the

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*. p. 196.

Comintern, but directs his attacks mainly against many of the political measures of the CPSU.

Yet any break with the Soviet Union and its Communist Party weakens the internal and external positions of the party concerned, while benefiting the imperialists.

Pointing to the harm that comes from opposing the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Union (for the world communist movement, but most of all for the parties concerned), William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, said this spurning of history "redounds with facts showing that anti-Sovietism has always been the common factor drawing together all enemies of peace and socialism". Kashtan stressed that those "who are concerned with the struggle for peace and socialism must never forget that the Soviet Union is the decisive factor in the world struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism. This does not mean that any one party is in a privileged position in regard to other parties in the world communist movement. But facts are facts, and it is the Soviet Union and the CPSU that carry the main burden and responsibility in the world-wide struggle."¹

The "particular" line towards the Soviet Union and the CPSU has not really cut any ice among the Communist and Workers' parties. The support for the opposite standpoint is far greater. It is the predominant view that the attitude towards the Soviet Union is the gauge of a party's political maturity and fidelity to socialism and proletarian internationalism; the struggle against imperialism and for socialism is inconceivable without the Soviet Union and the socialist countries.

Asked why the Central Committee of the French Communist Party said in an October 1968 resolution that strengthening ties with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the greatest of all concerns, Etienne Fajon, member of the Party's Political Bureau, said the French CP

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, pp. 354-55.

is an internationalist workers' party, meaning that it does not separate the interests of the French working class from those of the working class of other countries.

"This is exactly what the resolution expresses," he said. "If in this sense we attach particular importance to our relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, it is not because this fraternal party enjoys some privilege or undertakes the role of leader. It is due to a number of obvious reasons. . . . It performed the first victorious socialist revolution. It built the first socialist state. . . . But we should also assess what the USSR has become today as the bulwark of the working class and socialism, because to a decisive extent it is to the Soviet Union that socialism owes its existence and development in other countries. . . . Also, as the bulwark of peace, because the Soviet Union is the main obstacle to the aggressive policy of imperialism."¹

The maturity of the political leadership of a Communist party is measured by its ability to take concrete decisions based on the general principles of proletarian internationalism, dialectically combining national with international interests.

The programme documents of many Communist parties of capitalist countries set the main guidelines of the national road to socialism. But they do not confuse national with nationalist. Guided by the experience of the international working-class movement, they reject all forms of nationalism, for it is contrary to any truly national road to socialism because it aims at closing the national frontiers and dissociating the proletariat at home from the rest of the international working class.

Most Communist parties take the correct Marxist view of the correlation of the national and international elements. They vigorously oppose national exclusiveness and nationalism.

¹ *L'Humanité dimanche*, October 27, 1968.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIAL AND NATIONAL EMANCIPATION AND NATIONALISM

1. Lenin on Types of National Self-Determination

Lenin was the first to classify countries according to their national development and the maturity of their material premises for socialist revolution. "To be concrete," he said, "not less than *three* different types of countries must be distinguished when dealing with self-determination. . . . First type: the advanced countries of Western Europe (and America), where the national movement is a thing of the *past*. Second type: Eastern Europe, where it is a thing of the *present*. Third type: semi-colonies and colonies, where it is largely a thing of the *future*."¹

In his *Notebooks on Imperialism*, in the rough outline of the article "Statistics and Sociology", and in notes and speeches made at the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin extended this classification to cover the nation-state's material premises for socialist revolution (the relevant table is given below).

For each of these types Lenin defined its own "epoch of national and democratic movements", highlighted by national revolutions bourgeois in objective content and character—the 1566 Dutch bourgeois revolution, the English 1640 revolution, the French revolutions of 1789 and 1848, the 1848 revolution in Germany, the 1783 War of Independence and Civil War of 1861-1865 in the United States, and Japan's Meiji revolution in the case of the *first type* of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 38.

countries. They were headed by the bourgeoisie, for it was the era of ascendant capitalism, and resulted in more or less nationally homogeneous bourgeois states.

Revolutionary movements that were national in form and bourgeois in content introduced alterations in the national question. The solutions were limited by the bounds of bourgeois democracy. The national question, and national movements, now existed only along the margin of Western Europe, e.g., Ireland, Brittany, Norway.

	Types: Groups of countries	No. of states	Population (million)	% of oppressed nations	Epoch of national and democratic movements
I	Western Europe	(12) 17	242	7%	1789 (1789.1848) 1566 (*)-1871
	United States of America	1 19	99 394	11% 7%	1783-1865
	Japan	1	53	0%	—1871
II	Eastern Europe and its part of Asia	9	272	53%	(1848) 1905-1909
	South and Central America	20	82	?	(1823-1911)
III	Semi-colonies	10	366	?	1911
	Colonies	? about (60)?	557	100%	(?) Twentieth century
	Total	(118)	1,671		

(*) 1566 = beginning of Dutch revolution.¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 39, p. 715.

In the more or less homogeneous capitalist states, nationalism shed all its earlier democratic elements, its justification in history, and became part of the ideology and policy of the ruling capitalist class. It was increasingly invoked to fortify rule at home and expansion abroad, and to vindicate colonial plunder and oppression of conquered nations and peoples. It was exploited by the British bourgeoisie to retain its stranglehold on Ireland, make India a colony, and plunder China and Africa. The French bourgeoisie and Napoleon III used nationalism to push their expansionist policy in Italy, and to invade Mexico. The US bourgeoisie invoked nationalism in exterminating Indian tribes, seizing their land, and launching its expansion into the neighbouring Latin American countries. For the bourgeoisie, nationalism is also a means of subordinating the working class of the capitalist nation, and counteracting its internationalism.

Following the Paris Commune, with pre-monopoly capitalism giving way to monopoly capitalism and imperialism (at the turn of the 20th century), bourgeois nationalism took the form of chauvinism as the imperialist powers strained to assume control over other peoples. At this stage, the national question grew into the national-colonial question, for imperialism's colonial system was complete, and imperialist wars began to erupt for a redivision of the world. The trend towards reaction became distinctly stronger on the political scene.

Monopoly capital and the financial oligarchy were the main bearers of chauvinism, contaminating the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and the worker "aristocracy", and giving the upper classes a "stake" in the colonial booty and military contributions exacted from the defeated states. Transcending the framework of nation-states and growing more cosmopolitan, monopoly capital made national oppression world-wide, exercising political dominion in colonies and financial pressure on the politically independent small and weak states. The division of nations into oppressor and oppressed stood out more distinctly than ever before. Coun-

tries of the *first type* were mostly oppressor nations. Democratic elements remained only in the nationalism of the oppressed nations and peoples of Ireland, Wales and Scotland (Great Britain), Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Provinces (Spain), Quebec (Canada), of the Papuans and other ethnic minorities of Australia, and those of New Zealand, and in the USA and Belgium. Their national movements frequently grow into national uprisings. As a result of the Irish rising in 1916, part of the nation won the right to self-determination and founded its own state. Britain succeeded in retaining its hold on Northern Ireland by brute force. During the national-revolutionary war in Spain, the Basques and Catalonians won statehood (autonomy), but the defeat of the Spanish Republic and the establishment of the Franco dictatorship spelled an end to self-rule. Franco's terror tactics have held the national movements of the Basques, Catalonians and Galicians in rein.

Fascism is the most denuded and repulsive form of the nationalism of the monopoly bourgeoisie of oppressor nations. It is an undisguised terrorist dictatorship by the most reactionary and chauvinist imperialist section of finance capital, aiming to contain the general crisis of capitalism by terror and war, to block a social revolution, stamp out world socialism, the achievements of the October Socialist Revolution, and restore to capitalism its former undivided sway. Fascism capitalised on the frustrated national feelings of some of the oppressor nations, defeated or fancying a slight during the division of booty following the First World War. The fascists howled for revenge and exploited chauvinist geopolitical and racist ideas inherited from the medieval landed aristocracy.

The fascists tried to recut the world's political map, overrunning and exterminating entire nations, and dissolving long since established states. In reply, there rose a powerful anti-fascist national movement with distinct anti-monopoly and revolutionary overtones.

In a number of European and Asian countries, the defeat of Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and imperialist Japan by

the Soviet people and their allies saw the national anti-fascist movement grow into people's democratic revolutions. In Western Europe this was artificially prevented by the Anglo-American occupation, the establishment of US military bases, and constitution of the politico-military NATO bloc. However, the expansionism of US monopoly, impingements on the sovereignty of European states, coupled with the revival of revenge-seeking aspirations in West Germany, soon gave fresh impulse to national anti-monopoly movements in Western Europe.

These are headed by the working class, rallying ever broader sections to the struggle against state-monopoly capitalism, thus shifting the political axis in their countries further to the left. Political instability and the ever more obvious signs of an early revolutionary upswing are causing chauvinist monopoly groups to prime for a counter-offensive—anticipate revolution and perform a fascist overturn. The neo-fascists are trying to exploit the growing discontent of the masses, gain influence and envenom their minds with hatred of socialism, hostility towards neighbouring peoples, and chauvinist revenge-seeking ideas.

But the struggle of the countries of the socialist community and the working class in capitalist Europe for a collective security system, against the war danger, for a reduction of armed forces and armaments, and for peace, is undermining the political positions of the neo-fascists and helping the masses to free themselves from nationalist ideas.

The outstanding events of the epoch of national and democratic movements in countries of the *second type* were the national revolutions in Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, the cycle of revolutions in the Iberian Peninsula, the 1848-67 revolutionary movements in Austria, those of 1830, 1846-48 and 1863-64 in Poland, the 1825 Decembrist uprising and 1905 revolution in Russia, the war of independence of the Spanish colonies in America in 1810-26, the 1868-78 "great war" and 1895 national rising under José Martí in Cuba, the proclamation of the republic in Brazil in 1889, and the Mexican revolutions of 1857-67 and 1910-17.

The formation of states in Eastern and Southern Europe and Latin America occurred under conditions of a relatively delayed development of capitalism, with weak national markets and predominantly large-scale landownership. It was spurred by defensive needs (with the Ottoman Turks poised against Eastern and Southern Europe, and France, Spain and the United States seeking to enslave Latin America), before nations had become consolidated in the respective countries, which were exposed to economic exploitation by the more developed capitalist states of Western Europe and by the United States. Due to the slow consolidation of nations, most of the countries became multinational, with many peoples inhabiting them being nationally oppressed and unequal.

Not the bourgeoisie, but the gentry and the educated element headed the 19th-century national movements in Eastern and Southern Europe. This left a peculiar imprint on the class content of their nationalism. Its progressive elements, deriving from its orientation against foreign oppression, were largely muted, because the peasants (with few exceptions, one of these being Bulgaria) had not been drawn in as an active force as was the case during the classical bourgeois revolutions in West European countries. On the other hand, the landed aristocracy, which relied on religion to maintain its privileges, accentuated the reactionary elements. When capitalism entered the imperialist stage, the class content of the national question changed. So did the role of nationalism in the national movements.

The countries of the second type formed a system of chiefly multinational states at a medium level of capitalist development and with distinct survivals of pre-capitalist relations, especially in agriculture. This gave rise to the undemocratic political pattern. Unlike Western Europe, the United States and Japan, these countries had not consummated the cycle of bourgeois revolutions by the beginning of the imperialist stage. The resultant inner weaknesses turned them into objects of financial exploitation by the big imperialist powers.

With rare exceptions, their bourgeoisie proved incapable of leading the national movements either against foreign imperialism or against the over-riding landlord influence in the state. It proved incapable of consummating bourgeois-democratic changes, and this also in the case of the national question.

The national movements there were directed against foreign imperialism (externally), on the one hand, and against the chauvinism of the landlords and bourgeoisie of the dominant nation (internally), on the other. Here "there still exist oppressed and capitalistically undeveloped nations. Objectively, these nations still have general national tasks to accomplish, namely, *democratic* tasks, the tasks of *overthrowing foreign oppression*,"¹ Lenin wrote. And it is the working class that stood in the forefront of the revolutionary movement, that became its leading force. The knot of contradictions (between labour and capital, peasants and landlords, oppressed nationalities and the dominant nation, the dependent country and foreign imperialism, and others) facilitated the proletariat's international mission. Placing itself at the head of the peasants and oppressed nationalities, rallying the vast majority of the people, it was capable of consummating the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and setting out on a socialist revolution. It was therefore representative of the *entire* nation, of all forward-looking people of *all* classes. And to prevent the fusion of diverse revolutionary movements, to divide the proletariat, to obstruct its historical mission, the landlords and bourgeoisie invoked nationalism and chauvinism.

The other type singled out by Lenin were the colonies and semi-colonies (among the latter he listed Turkey, Persia and China). There the epoch of national and democratic movements began at the dawn of the 20th century. The October Socialist Revolution in Russia destroyed the strategic designs of the imperialists, who had expected to

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 59.

divide the semi-colonies during the First World War, and to reduce them to colonies. The rising national consciousness in the semi-colonies, spurred by the 1905 revolution in Russia, and still more by the October Revolution, precipitated national revolutions and saw politically independent states emerge in place of the semi-colonies. The growth of socialism into a world system and the resulting weaknesses of capitalism enabled the national liberation movement in Asia and Africa, aided by the international working class and its main force, the socialist community, to begin demolishing the colonial system. Almost nothing has remained of it. By 1970 the population in the still surviving colonies was less than 30 million, whereas 1,000 million people were under colonial rule in 1914. Newly-independent states appeared on the ruins of the colonial system in Asia, Africa, Oceania and the Caribbean.

They developed as states in entirely different conditions than the nations of Europe and America. Many of the peoples had not yet formed into nations. They had no national markets or only embryonic markets, having but recently served as agrarian and raw materials adjuncts of the metropolitan countries. Furthermore, the imperialists had marked off their boundaries in total disregard of their ethnic and linguistic background. These new states inherited the national and ethnic strife that had been cultivated by the colonialists. But despite some common features, they cannot be classed under one head. Their peoples acquired national sovereignty in a new historical environment. They were able to choose their way of development, for aid and support was forthcoming from the socialist community. And where the overthrow of colonial rule, the national revolution, was led by the proletariat headed by a Marxist-Leninist party, the new states opted for the socialist way, and became part of the world socialist system. But in some other former colonies, where the material and political conditions for this were lacking, where the proletariat was either non-existent or too weak, the leadership fell to other social forces.

A group of socialist-oriented states emerged in Asia and Africa. They form a non-capitalist zone of some 10 million sq. km. with a population of 100 million. Today they are in the midst of deep-going social, economic and political changes (the enterprises of many foreign monopolies and big local capitalists are being nationalised, a radical agrarian reform is under way, the state has put itself in control of the commanding heights in the economy, follows an independent foreign policy, and maintains diversified ties with the socialist community; illiteracy is being eliminated, working people are being drawn into government, and so on). At the present stage, the leadership there is in the hands of revolutionary democrats. They have formed their own parties, and govern under the flag of "revolutionary nationalism" in the name of the peasants and the democratic elements of the urban petty bourgeoisie. The political attitudes of these parties are still in evolution, reacting sensitively to changes in the alignment of class forces at home and in international relations. Their evolution is not unambiguous, and certainly not arrow-straight. In some cases it gravitates towards bourgeois attitudes, complying with the pressure of the bourgeois elements and imperialist manoeuvres. In other cases, however, the revolutionary democrats defy imperialism and turn to the experience of the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, in a bid to cope with the difficulties and resolve their country's social, political, cultural and economic problems. Many look to the theory of scientific socialism for answers to their questions, and opt for cooperation with the Communists. True, the leaders of revolutionary-democratic parties have disparate notions about socialism. Many points in their position are unclear, even incorrect, with socialist ideas interlacing strangely with religious dogma and nationalist prejudice. All the same, socialist ideas make headway, reaching the consciousness and entering the life of the liberated peoples.

The conflicting nature and uncertain class content of nationalism naturally also affect its democratic elements. At times they are obviously immature due to the utopian

illusions prevailing among the peasants and lower urban strata. Often the utopian illusions are clad in socialist garb, but become politically reactionary as they transcend the domains of psychology and ideology and enter the domain of practice.

Some new states have been caught in the nets of neo-colonialism and drawn into aggressive politico-military alliances (e.g., Malawi, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia). Their orientation is distinctly capitalist, with power in the hands of bourgeois compradore, or even feudal, elements connected with foreign monopoly. The main ingredient of the nationalism prevailing among their ruling classes is anti-communism garnished with medieval religious or reactionary racist conceptions.

Many of the newly-independent states do not come under either of these two heads, for they have not yet made their option. Though they may have travelled some way along the road to capitalism, their socialist-oriented political parties are visibly gathering strength (as in India, Sri Lanka and Nigeria). The acute struggle there between reactionary pro-imperialist elements and the democratic forces results in frequent changes of the class content of their governments.

In India, Sri Lanka and Lebanon, for example, the proletariat and its Communist parties exercise a palpable influence on the course of the politico-ideological struggle.

The Marxists-Leninists there are aware of the different class contents of the different nationalist trends. They denounce the conservative and self-protective nationalism of the rich landlords and pro-imperialist bourgeoisie, and criticise the nationalism of the local bourgeoisie with its reformist ideas and dreams of "independent capitalist development". The programme of the Lebanese Communist Party (adopted at its Second Congress in 1968) decries the bourgeois-nationalist concept of states economically independent from international monopoly and ruled by the Arab bourgeoisie. No such thing exists. The bourgeoisie is not capable of heading the battle for economic independence

and radical social change. But the Communists there reckon with the fact that nationalism is part of the creed of the revolutionary democrats, that it is the outlook of a large section of the people still in the dark about their essential class interests.

The Communists are aware of the contradictory aspects of petty-bourgeois nationalism. It is one thing for revolutionary democrats to gravitate towards conciliation with the bourgeoisie and imperialism, to cover their anti-communism with nationalist slogans and, turning into zealous bourgeois national-reformists, to try and consolidate the dependent capitalist state. And it is an entirely different thing when revolutionary democrats move from nationalism and alliance with the bourgeoisie towards scientific socialism and alliance with the working class. But even in the latter case, while accepting political alliance with the revolutionary democrats, the Communists do not terminate their ideological work against nationalist prejudices. "The shift of the progressive elements of non-proletarian origin to the positions of scientific socialism," says the programme of the Lebanese Communist Party, "is a complicated and gradual process. Throughout this process there are attempts to create various theories of national socialism, ignoring the unity of world history, the unity of the world revolutionary movements, and the economic and social laws determining the main line of social development. These theories downgrade the role of the working class and the popular masses. There are also theories about an alleged contradiction between 'rich' and 'poor' states. To make matters worse, these theories ignore the class nature of the social system in progressive states."

The evolution of revolutionary democrats towards scientific socialism and political alliance with the Communists and the socialist community, would be far more rapid if imperialists, neo-colonialists and Maoist supporters did not impede the process. Maoist attempts in some countries to saddle the working-class movement with nationalist conceptions, their "advice" not to criticise nationalism and to exploit nationalist slogans, are a roadblock to further revolu-

tionary change and hold up the consolidation of the anti-imperialist front. Those who were unwise and took this "advice" (with the entailed loss of ideological independence), have paid a high price for their lack of insight, and have forfeited many political positions. Their orientation shifted to the right.

Firm defence of internationalist positions and closer political alliance with all patriotic forces accelerate the revolutionary advance towards social liberation, and facilitate changes in the state's general political orientation towards democracy and progress. This is borne out by the experience of the Communists in Iraq, and also in Sri Lanka and India.

**National Movements
as Part of the World
Revolutionary
Process**

For a national movement to be part of the world revolutionary process, it must be anti-imperialist, must fight against imperialism. This is a basic requirement. Imperialism is usually a nationally-alien enemy. Furthermore, for the bulk of the people it is also a class enemy. Since the imperialist-oppressed countries are unequal partners in the capitalist world market, the anti-imperialist national movements undermine the capitalist system from within, while the working class in the developed capitalist states fights imperialism in its citadels.

National movements with a general democratic content may have different orientations. Some are directed chiefly against remnants of colonial oppression (as in Zimbabwe, South Africa, Oceania, and in the US, British, Dutch, and French colonies in the Antilles). Others are against US-imposed neo-colonialist puppet regimes (South Vietnam, Cambodia, and South Korea), and still others are movements of oppressed national minorities (USA, Canada, New Zealand, Australia), or for reunification.

Some national movements arise in newly-independent states with a variety of modes of production and a pre-capitalist structure, and no national markets—states which are agrarian and raw materials adjuncts of the metropolitan countries. Other national movements arise in countries with

fully formed national markets (though the modes of production there may be numerous, the capitalist is the dominant mode).

Accordingly, in some countries the national movement works for political independence and a national state, while in others it fights for the self-rule or equality of national minorities.

In some cases national movements grow into social movements. For some countries this is a revolutionary interruption of capitalist development, adoption of the non-capitalist way, and subsequent transition (through intermediary stages) to socialism. But in all cases, the anti-imperialist orientation stands out, uniting the national movements and suggesting close alliance with socialism and the working class of the capitalist countries.

However, apart from the historically progressive there are also regressive national movements, which imperialism uses against the struggle for national liberation.

**The Social Role
of Nationalism
in Present-Day
National Movements**

Since in the liberated countries the contraposition of one's social-ethnic community to other communities is chiefly connected with opposition to imperialism, the democratic elements of nationalism often advance to the foreground. And since their main bearers are peasants and the urban poor, nationalism has a relatively progressive content.

The main criteria of the progressive elements of nationalism are the attitude to imperialism and the existing social structure, and the social orientation (political option and the attitude to the socialist world). And the gauge of progressiveness is practice.

As the national liberation movement grows into a movement for social liberation and the revolutionary processes become deeper, the progressive elements of nationalism recede, while the reactionary grow.

The diversity of social-economic structures and ethnic groups, and the incomplete consolidation of tribes into nationalities and nations, enables imperialism to capitalise

on the reactionary essence of nationalism, to use it for dividing national movements, eroding them, and opposing them to the revolutionary front and the socialist community. Imperialism takes advantage of the relative maturity of class antagonisms in some national movements, and gains the support of self-protective conservative elements against socialism. It tries (along with the local exploiting classes) to cultivate nationalism in the working-class movement of the newly-free countries, preventing the proletariat from becoming an independent political force and obscuring the socialist perspective.

The concrete historical approach means that we must examine the specific manner in which nationalism manifests itself in the disparate and specific social-economic conditions and class structures of different countries, in the different geographic conditions, in the different conditions created by differences in history, ethnic origin and culture.

2. Nationalism in Bourgeois and Petty-Bourgeois Parties in Latin America

The revolutionary processes in Latin America are working more rapidly than in other parts of the non-socialist world. This may be illustrated by the Cuban revolution, the achievements of the Popular Unity bloc in Chile, and the deep-going anti-imperialist revolutionary changes in Peru. For the revolutionary forces there nationalism is frequently a synonym of anti-imperialism. We should therefore examine its class essence and social base, and its real relation to the anti-imperialist struggle. The 1969 International Meeting, the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and the Communist and Workers' parties of Latin America have given answers to these questions.

Latin America is not homogeneous. Most of the countries there threw off the colonial yoke and won political independence in the beginning of the 19th century. But being

economically backward and weak, they fell into financial and diplomatic bondage and became something like vassals to imperialist powers. Yet the concrete forms of dependence on imperialism, and the level of social, economic, political and cultural development differ from country to country. So does the ethnic or national structure.

Some countries (a) are building the foundations of socialist society and are part of the world socialist system (Cuba); (b) others are of a transitional type and their progressive anti-imperialist revolutionary regimes have rejected the capitalist way of social development (Peru); (c) some countries, at a medium level of capitalism, are financially dependent and moving towards state-monopoly capitalism (Brazil and others); (d) there are also agrarian, financially dependent countries of a low level of capitalist development (Haiti, Paraguay and others); (e) newly-independent countries built on the ruins of the British colonial empire but still kept in neo-colonialist bondage (Guyana and others), and (f) colonies of the United States, Britain, France, and Holland.

Apart from these main types and their varieties, there are many intermediate forms of dependence and development levels.

All the Latin American countries, save Cuba, are part of the world capitalist economy. Their place in it is unequal, and they are subjected to imperialist exploitation. This creates an objective basis for the anti-imperialist movement.

But the tasks and forms of the anti-imperialist movement there differ from those of the anti-colonial struggle for national independence, that is, for statehood, in Asia and Africa, because the Latin American states were at no time a part of the imperialist colonial system and were subject to other forms of imperialist oppression.

Although Latin America threw off the colonial trammels a mere three or four decades after the United States, it lagged far behind the latter in development at the beginning of the 20th century, whereas some three centuries before it had been the British colonies in North America that were

a wretched provincial wilderness compared with the densely-populated Spanish colonies proud of the wealth of their cities and the prestige of their universities. Some North American scholars, as well as those in Latin America itself, ascribe the continent's slow development not to the exploitation of foreign capital and the local ruling class, but to its national, even racial, composition. Before analysing the social and class content of the anti-imperialist movement (for this alone can explain the appearance of nationalist interpretations of its tasks), we should therefore see what aspects of the national element are exploited in these nationalist interpretations.

Latin American nationalism and nationalist phenomena in its anti-imperialist revolutionary movement will be a riddle to us, unless we consider the history of the formation of Latin American nations.

**Formation
of Nations
in Iberian America¹**

The Spanish and Portuguese colonial system in America had many modes of production, and its administrative units differed in development. Where the conquerors found Indian societies at the tribal stage they either exterminated the population or drove it into remote, all but inaccessible areas. This is how settlers' colonies came into being. The territory they covered included the Rio de la Plata area, a considerable portion of Chile, part of Brazil, the Caribbean islands, and Costa Rica. A mingling of races began, reflected in the present-day toponymy, vocabulary and social psychology.

The dominant trend was the formation of Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking (Latinophonic) nationalities, consisting mostly of settlers from Spain and Portugal. Yet at the end of the 18th century it was still unclear on what languages the formation of nations would be based—Spanish and Portuguese or the more developed of the regional Indian

¹ Iberian American countries are those colonised by the Iberian powers: Spain and Portugal. We leave aside the formation of nations in the Caribbean colonial enclaves of Britain and Holland.

languages (Quechua, Guarani, Tupi, etc.). This was settled by the ouster of the Jesuits, the peasant wars of the end of the 18th century, and finally the wars of independence in the Spanish colonies. Once the barriers that had isolated the region from the rest of the world were torn down, the industrial development that followed gave precedence to the Latinophonic basis. Plantation slave labour was the dominant mode of production in the Caribbean area and Brazil. Extensive importation of African slaves began, resulting in an intermingling of Africans of different tribes, who were compelled to accept the language and culture of their masters.

The Latin American settler countries became nationally homogeneous, though they are populated by compact groups of colonists—Spaniards, Germans, Slavs, Jews, Arabs, Chinese and Japanese. With the exception of the Japanese, these groups assimilate fairly well with the respective Spanish-speaking nations (Argentine, Uruguayan, Costa Rican, etc.). The Argentine nation absorbed a large number of Italians, which has left a trace on the vocabulary, the national character and culture. The Brazilian nation assimilated a mass of Africans and a considerable number of German colonists.

Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Brazil, Honduras and Guyana are multinational countries. Indian tribes make up a large percentage of their populations. Yet, apart from Bolivia and Guyana, the bulk of the population belongs to the respective Spanish-speaking nations. There are also Indian nationalities and ethnic groups. The formation of nations is peculiar, because Indian languages are used fairly extensively alongside the national language. And whether the Indian ethnic groups develop into nationalities or nations or will be part of a bilingual or multilingual nation depends on the future direction of the revolutionary process.

In Bolivia, the majority of the population is Indian. But apart from the antagonisms between the Spanish-speaking nation and the Indian peoples, there is also a sharp conflict

between the Quechua and Aymara Indians. In Paraguay, the mestizo population has adopted Guarani, an Indian language. Thus, the Paraguayan nation has a bilingual basis (Spanish and Guarani), a fact reflected in its theatre and literature. The Guarani-speaking and other Indian tribes are, in effect, national minorities.

The destruction of productive forces in the 1791 rebellion in Haiti, and especially during the French colonial war, and the fact that after the war the plantations were distributed as rewards to the officers of the Haitian army, resulted in a feudalisation of Haitian society in the 19th century. And up to now it is racked by Negro-mulatto racial antagonisms that tend to obscure contradictions of a class origin. This situation was exploited by US imperialism during Haiti's occupation in 1915-34 and later, when it imposed a succession of tyrannical racist Negro regimes like that of the Duvalier family. The Duvalier tyranny is retarding the development of the Haitian people into a nation. It propagates the Negritude concept and exploits voodooism to retain its grip on power, and plays on racial prejudices to incite hatred against the Spanish-speaking people of the neighbouring Dominican Republic. Its ideology is reactionary nationalism with distinctly racist overtones.¹

As we see, the formative process of Latin American nations differs from the "classical" formation of capitalist nations in Europe, and also from the peculiar conditions in which nations are developing in modern Africa.

The process started in the colonial period, when local markets began to shape into national markets, laying the foundation for future Latin American states. It continued in the 19th and 20th centuries. Yet the long time it took for nations to form and the emergence, as distinct from Western Europe, of mainly multinational states at the beginning of the 19th century, give the national movements in Latin America points of resemblance with those of

¹ Cerard Pierre-Charles, *Radiografía de una Dictadura. Haiti bajo el Régimen del doctor Duvalier*, Mexico, 1969.

Eastern and Southern Europe. The main similarity is the incomplete solution of the national question.

The apparent reason for the incomplete solution of the national question may be traced to foreign exploitation—colonial in the 16th-19th centuries and financial in the 19th and 20th centuries. But the intrinsic reason is the agrarian question, the fact, for example, that peasants of the national minorities suffer from a triple yoke—class oppression by landowners who combine pre-capitalist with capitalist methods of exploitation, national oppression by the landowners and capitalists of “other nationalities”, and oppression by imperialist powers. The unresolved state of the agrarian question and the survival of pre-capitalist ways is reflected in the entire superstructure and is strongly retarding the development of bourgeois democracy—this also in the sphere of national relations. The effect on capitalist development is negative. It is deformed and drawn out in time.

The Latin American states (excluding Cuba and the newly-independent Caribbean colonies) are old. They have followed the capitalist way for over 150 years, and such countries as Brazil, Mexico and Colombia are now going over to state-monopoly economic structures. As a result, the national element is highly dynamic, complex and contradictory. The fact that national consolidation has not run its full course in some countries, the antagonisms between emerging nationalities and fully-formed nations, coupled with dependence on US imperialism, have produced an intricate assortment of contradictions—fertile soil for peculiar manifestations of nationalism.

**The Class
Content
of Nationalism**

In the newly-free Afro-Asian countries the local bourgeoisie is still sometimes ranged alongside the peasant democrats. As a result, progressive democratic elements can be fairly strong in the content of their bourgeois nationalism. In Latin America, the nationalism of the dominant nations (whose content is bourgeois, because the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisified landowners

are the commanding force and have the might of the state behind them) lacks this general democratic social content. In fact, it is anti-democratic. It has close politico-ideological ties with fascism. Under cover of this nationalism, local church and landlord reaction abetted by foreign monopolies performed military coups in Argentina in 1930, 1955 and 1966. In Chile, the financial and landed oligarchy and other quarters close to the US imperialists conducted an unbridled nationalist campaign, preparing the ground for the reactionary overthrow of the Popular Unity government. Bourgeois-oligarchic nationalism is often rooted in medieval conceptions. It speculates on Latin America's cultural affinity with Spain and accentuates the most reactionary aspects of this cultural legacy. In the 20th century it has assumed the garb of Argentinidad, Mexicanidad, Peruanidad, etc.—concepts based on the alleged existence of an irrational and exclusive soul as the root of a collective personality, the nation.¹ Its proponents associate nationalism with Catholicism. "Catholicism is the root and summit of our nationality," writes V. A. Belaúnde, creator of the Peruanidad concept. "It embraces and sustains the existence of our collective soul."²

The democratic elements of Latin American nationalism are inconsiderable, sustained by the peasants and the urban middle strata, which include the fairly numerous marginal groups lacking permanent employment and earning their livelihood at casual jobs; psychologically, they resemble the lumpenproletariat.

The democratic tendencies originate usually among the radical section of intellectuals and students, and among the patriotic elements in the army and church.

The fragmentation of the medieval Spanish empire and the emergence on its ruins of national and multinational states, was a progressive thing in its day. The subjective aspi-

¹ Samuel L. Bailly, *Labor, Nationalism and Politics in Argentina*, New Jersey, 1967.

² *Siete pensadores*, Lima, 1968, p. 26.

rations to overcome the "balkanisation" of Latin America, however, breed a continental nationalism (Joaquín Edwards-Bello, Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre, Felipe Barreda Laos, Eduardo Frei Montalva, etc.). It has no clerical overtones, is secularised in content, and has borrowed many of its elements from rightist West European social-democratic and demochristian ideologues.

Genetically, this continental nationalism is a petty-bourgeois current. Its exponents are mainly reformist intellectuals and students, or ultra-left elements playing at revolution. It urges an end to the "balkanisation" of Latin America and aspires to a federative or some other kind of Latin American community of nations operating internationally as one of the great powers. Petty-bourgeois reformers want it to be part of an inter-American system headed by the USA. As a first step, they urge the continent's economic integration on the basis of a Latin American variant of the Marshall Plan.

The petty-bourgeois radicals want to do away with the borders. They urge integration through an all-continental revolutionary war.

Some continental nationalists claim that the intermingling of the races in Latin America has produced a new race—a prototype of the future world population (José Vasconcelos' "cosmic race"). Haya de la Torre holds that an American civilisation has thus branched away from the West European, and that it, too, has two branches—the North American and Latin American.

All this is but a disguised form of great-power nationalism, stemming from the bourgeoisie or petty-bourgeoisie promoting the case of their own countries. The Peruvian Haya de la Torre, for example, maintains that Peru is the "natural centre" of Indo-America, and he, Haya de la Torre, its "natural leader". He took the name of Pachacutec, the Inca conqueror, as his pen-name.

If there is to be a world-wide anti-imperialist front, we must combat continental chauvinism, pointed out Jaime Cuellar Gallego (Anteo Quimbaya), member of the

CP of Colombia Central Committee, "for it is an obstacle to the marshalling of anti-imperialist forces".¹

The chauvinism and anti-communism of continental nationalists leads them to cooperate with US imperialism, on the one hand, and to sharper differences with neighbouring Latin American countries, on the other. Foreign imperialists have capitalised on nationalist tendencies of this kind to divide the Latin American peoples. They provoked the war between Chile, Peru and Bolivia, for example, and the Chako war between Bolivia and Paraguay, and also the war between Peru and Ecuador. Time and again, they incited the Nicaraguan militarists to invade Costa Rica and Guatemala, exporting counter-revolution to those two countries. And US imperialists provoke border clashes and other conflicts between Latin American states, in order to step in and play the mediator. This was the case in the 1969 war between Salvador and Honduras, and this is the case when they encouraged military rivalry between Argentina and Brazil, Venezuela and Colombia.

Though subjected to foreign imperialist oppression, most of the capitalist Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking nations of Latin America are, in fact, oppressor nations vis-à-vis the Indian peoples, tribes and ethnic groups, and other national minorities. As a result, the nationalism there is twice as reactionary and twice as chauvinistic.

But there are also varieties of nationalism with progressive elements.

Besides, it should be remembered that due to social immaturity and theoretical confusion, members of the liberation movement often fight for national interests under nationalist slogans. They also call themselves nationalists. In Mexico, Lázaro Cárdenas' progressive government (1934-40) accomplished important anti-imperialist measures under the nationalist banner, including nationalisation of the oil industry and the railways. In Bolivia, the 1952 revolution, which had the same nationalist slogans, resulted in the na-

¹ *Documentos políticos*, No. 84, Bogota, 1969, p. 54.

tionalisation of tin mines and oil fields, and deep-going agrarian changes. In Brazil, a powerful movement in the 50s and early 60s tried to protect the country's national wealth from the predatory US monopolies and actuate an independent foreign policy.¹ To this movement Brazil owes a set of important legislative acts in the national interest. And in Venezuela, progressive democratic forces, including the Communist Party, are assaulting imperialism under the same slogans of "revolutionary nationalism".

There is a progressive trend among Latin American states committed to the capitalist way for joint action against US imperialist economic diktat. It is a move towards Latin American integration to counter the US-bossed Pan-American system. It has materialised in a Special Commission for Latin American Coordination (CECLA). Another result is the consolidation of the Andes Group [of countries], which worked out a joint policy on foreign investments.

This policy is oriented against the US monopolies and the unqualified support they receive from North American imperialism. It is therefore economically progressive, and also progressive for being anti-imperialist. All the same, it is essentially bourgeois, based on ideas of continental nationalism, "the purpose of which is to assert the Latin American identity as typified by its mentality, values, and forms of organisation".² This idea of specifically Latin American thinking and its corresponding values, which takes no account of social classes and opposes the Latin American countries (regardless of their system) not only to the imperialist powers, but also to all "industrial states", is clear evidence of the narrowness of bourgeois nationalism. Sometimes, the concept is but a constituent of the more general current towards transition (by successive reforms) to a state-monopoly type society and is, of course, reactionary in content. The local monopolies that exist in some Latin Ameri-

¹ L. C. Prestes, *A situação política e a luta por um governo nacionalista e democrático*, Rio de Janeiro, 1959.

² See *Tribuna popular*, Caracas, No. 44, 1970.

can countries are trying to step into the shoes of the US monopolies operating in the area as junior partners of US imperialism in "defending" Western or Christian civilisation. Referring to US "preoccupation" with Europe and Southeast Asia, and to "insufficient" US concern with Latin America, they dream of an "integrated" South America. Geopolitical schemes are also served up with a nationalist garnish and even adorned with references to national revolutionary traditions. And that is why petty-bourgeois ideologues could not be more wrong in claiming that "revolutionary nationalism is the key to socialism in present-day Latin America". The more likely objective result is a society of a directly opposite type.

**Nationalism
in Latin America
and US Strategy**

The US monopolies claim Latin America as their exclusive sphere of interest. Like Canada, it has been the main area of US monopoly investments, and the main supplier of raw materials, for many dozens of years. In 1960 direct US private monopoly investments in Latin America (US \$8,400 million) still exceeded US interests in Western Europe (US \$6,700 million). By 1970, however, though they grew considerably (chiefly through reinvestment of profit), Latin America slipped to third place after Western Europe and Canada.

Direct US private investments (\$ mlns.) in 1970

Total investments abroad — 78,090

Western Europe — 24,471

Canada — 22,801

Latin America — 12,201

Asia and Africa (excluding Japan and the Republic of South Africa) — 9,216¹

This is an indication that Latin America's place in US imperialist global strategy has decreased. North American monopolists seem to be able to afford threats that they will

¹ *Survey of Current Business*, No. 10, Washington, 1971, p. 32.

stop investing in Latin American countries acting to protect their natural resources from monopoly plunder, nationalising monopoly enterprises and consolidating their sovereignty. These perfectly legitimate actions are portrayed by North American propaganda as acts of "economic nationalism".¹ In fact, there is nothing nationalistic about them: it is the sovereign right of every nation to deal with its resources as it sees fit. Undeniably, one of the aims of the US monopolies is to preserve Latin America as the backyard of North American finance capital. They are disturbed by the expanding anti-imperialist struggle there, and the emergence of most of the Latin American peoples from their state of isolation. The US imperialists are discovering that an ever greater number of political groupings on the continent are advocating independence from "US domination and influence".²

US imperialists support those varieties of nationalism that help the pro-imperialist forces to consolidate. For them, the concept "American system" has an imperialist, pan-American ring, and they identify its interests with those of the US ruling classes, inferring "special relations" between the USA and Latin America. But since pan-Americanism is discredited among Latin Americans, it has been replaced by the term inter-Americanism as a concession to the mounting nationalist sentiment and to win the reformist petty bourgeoisie for the idea of a political and military alliance with the United States.

Meanwhile, US imperialism continues to exploit Latin American nationalism in mass media specifically addressed to the Latin American intelligentsia. It urges tolerance of "nationalistic expression" on the continent, and tries to use nationalism for acts of ideological diversion. These are aimed at disrupting the ideological unity of Communist parties,

¹ *The Rockefeller Report on the Americas*. The Official Report of a United States Presidential Mission for the Western Hemisphere, by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Chicago, 1969, pp. 29-34.

² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

at winning over the intellectuals and petty-bourgeois groups, and at blocking contacts between Communists and peasants.

The main weapon against proletarian internationalism are allegations of "ideological colonialism". This anti-Soviet ploy was first used by Haya de la Torre, leader of the Peruvian APRA (American People's Revolutionary Alliance), in order to justify cooperation between national-reformists and US imperialism, which de la Torre described as "economic imperialism".

Though it exploits underdeveloped countries, "economic imperialism", Haya de la Torre claims, benefits their economic development by its export of capital. And "ideological imperialism", he says, implies export of ideas that disrupt national unity, inciting workers to strike and disorganise the economy and hold up economic growth.

Then comes his startling conclusion: since the USSR is an industrial power its interests diverge from those of the economically underdeveloped states. He blames the Soviet Union for, of all things, provoking strikes in Latin America. Soviet and Latin American Communists, he complains, create disorder so as to prevent Latin American countries from becoming developed industrial states and so as thereby to assure Soviet-American world supremacy. The peaceful coexistence policy, he amplifies, is meant to cover up this ungodly conspiracy. He suggests a "positive" nationalist alternative to the anti-imperialist democratic revolution: a united front of lesser countries which, once they unite, will dictate their will to the "great powers".

For Haya de la Torre China and Brazil come under the head of "lesser countries", and he acclaims the Maoist political line, betraying his desire of creating an abyss between the countries of the socialist system and the economically weak states, of disrupting the unity of the socialist community.

Criticising this counterposition of the artificially construed "third world" and socialism, Héctor P. Agosti, member of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Argentina, said:

"The nationalist tendency . . . tries to equate all the components of the illusory 'third world', opposing them as one whole to the 'developed countries', whether capitalist or socialist; the differences in the internal development and historical tradition of each of these components are consigned to oblivion."¹

The anti-Soviet, anti-socialist and anti-patriotic tenor of the concept of an "underdeveloped" front is underscored by APRA calls for a strong "inter-American system", maintaining that the United States economy and that of the Latin American countries should be "mutually complementary". The vicious nationalistic attacks on the USSR and the Latin American Communist parties are meant to disguise the defeatist pro-imperialist APRA policy and its conciliation with Peru's landed oligarchy and the North American monopolies. Haya de la Torre can claim the doubtful distinction of having suggested that his country's supreme legislative body should form one more chamber to represent the foreign monopolies operating in Peru. He and his followers were angered by the anti-imperialist moves of the Alvarado government and have joined hands with the US monopolies in cooking up conspiracies to restore a pro-imperialist regime.

The US propaganda machine is using these nationalist anti-Soviet "theories", which are close kin to the fashionable bourgeois concept of "de-ideologisation", to mislead left-leaning Latin American intellectuals and capitalist groups favouring closer relations with the USSR.

A US Information Agency author writing under the name of Victor Alba distinguishes between a positive nationalism and a negative one. Under the head of negative nationalism he puts all consistently anti-imperialist movements, especially those advocating a socialist future for Latin America. These are portrayed as trends seeking to disrupt the nation, subordinate individual interests to those of the state, leading to autarky and isolation from other American nations. Alba

¹ *Nueva Era*, Buenos Aires, No. 3, 1969, p. 245.

deliberately replaces abstract terms for class categories, and contrasts the so-called creative nationalism, the alleged prelude to a convergence of American nations, which he classes as positive, to the anti-imperialist national positions of the Communist parties. What Alba does not explain is that such a convergence of unequal nations would place them under the umbrella of US imperialism.¹

The Communist parties are compelled to reckon with the fact that in Venezuela, Brazil, and also in Peru and Bolivia, the masses have rallied against imperialism under nationalist slogans. This means that the fight against bourgeois nationalism must be confined chiefly to the propaganda and theoretical plane. But in those countries where nationalism contains few or no democratic elements, where nationalist slogans are used exclusively by reactionary extremists, the Communist parties expose nationalism in every possible way, including through the daily press. The United Party of Haitian Communists, for example, keeps under constant fire the nationalist demagoguery of the Duvalier tyranny.

3. Nationalism in the Latin American Liberation Movement

At the present stage, the aim of the anti-imperialist liberation movement in Latin America is to win economic independence. But this in a different sense from that in the young Afro-Asian countries. The material premises for socialism are more mature in Latin America. It has a numerous working class, which has formed Marxist-Leninist parties in nearly all the countries of the continent and which occupies a vanguard place in the anti-imperialist struggle. This is why to win economic independence means to push through extensive and urgent economic, social and political revolutionary changes.

The vast majority of Latin American countries have been

¹ V. Alba, *El frentismo*, Mexico, 1965, pp. 82-88.

developing along capitalist lines for more than 150 years. They have been dependent countries, and therefore doomed to backwardness, poverty and stagnation. Their structural crisis is the crisis of a dependent capitalist society, aggravated by strong medieval survivals. The way out is a socialist-oriented anti-imperialist, agrarian, democratic revolution. And the peoples in Latin America are poised to perform it. The transitional regimes in some of the Latin American countries have set out on anti-imperialist revolutionary-democratic changes, which may transcend the capitalist framework and pave the way to a socialist future. This growth of one phase of the unintermittent revolutionary process into the next occurs at different rates and in apparently dissimilar forms, with a dissimilar alignment of class forces, and with dissimilar national traditions. As recorded at the 24th CPSU Congress, important revolutionary-democratic changes are under way in this zone.

In these circumstances, nationalist bourgeois reformists, who want to avert revolutionary change, advocate struggle for economic independence. Some of them even refer to Lenin's well-known observation:

"... They are talking of *national* liberation in the Balkans, leaving out *economic* liberation. Yet in reality it is the latter that is the chief thing.

"Given complete liberation from the landlords and from absolutism, national liberation and complete freedom of self-determination of the peoples would be an inevitable result... Nothing but economic and political liberation of the *peasants* of all the Balkan nationalities, carried through to the end, can eliminate all possibility of any sort of national oppression."¹

This quotation is from Lenin's article, "The Social Significance of the Serbo-Bulgarian Victories". The nationalists twist it to mean that semi-colonial and dependent countries must first liberate themselves economically. Yet by economic liberation Lenin meant liberation of peasants from ethnical-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, pp. 398-99.

ly foreign landlord oppression. Economic liberation from imperialist oppression, in the sense in which we understand it today, was impossible at the turn of the century, because the national liberation movement was then still a part of the world bourgeois-democratic revolution. Here is what Lenin wrote at the time: "It would be quixotism and whining if Social-Democrats were to tell the workers that there could be salvation somewhere apart from the development of capitalism, not through the development of capitalism. But we do not say this. We say: capital devours you, will devour the Persians, will devour everyone and go on devouring until you overthrow it. That is the truth. And we do not forget to add: except through the growth of capitalism there is no guarantee of victory over it."¹

Not until the October Socialist Revolution and the growth of the national liberation movement into a constituent of the world revolutionary process associated with the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, did it become possible to pose the objective of economic liberation for the backward countries.

In Latin America the social antagonisms have matured to a point where they come to the surface in the ranks of the anti-imperialist liberation movement. The local bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism try to transfer them from the social-class plane to the national and even racial. This is why they encourage nationalist conceptions in the working-class movement.

To substantiate the legend of "communist pluralism",² US imperialists call in the political splinter groups and individual renegades expounding "national Trotskyism" (the Guillermo Lora group in Bolivia) or "national Stalinism" (the L. Reinoso group in Chile, and Eugenio Gómez group in Uruguay). Conducting a fierce ideological battle against Marxism-Leninism, claiming that Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system, US imperialists

¹ Ibid., Vol. 34, p. 438.

² *Marxism in Latin America*, ed. by L. Aguilar, N. Y., 1969.

encourage and support both right-revisionist and "left"-revisionist nationalist distortions of Marxist-Leninist theory; these short-term practical actions are aimed at definite sections of the public in some of the Latin American countries.

The communist movement in Latin America was born in struggles against nationalist perversions of socialist principles. And it is totally faithful to its proletarian internationalist tradition. The CP of Argentina, the oldest Communist party in the Western Hemisphere, was founded in January 1918 as an internationalist socialist party protesting the chauvinism of the old socialist leadership. Winning over the honest elements in the anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist movement, the young Communist parties of Latin America also opposed the national nihilism of the anarchists. They joined the anti-imperialist movement, and did their utmost to move the centre of gravity from the racial and cultural plane to the plane of struggle against the monopolies of the United States and other powers.

This was the purpose for which the Communist parties and their allies founded the Anti-Imperialist League of America in 1925, with branches in various Latin American countries and the United States. This League was in fact an alliance of proletarian revolutionaries and petty-bourgeois and bourgeois nationalists to resist US territorial expansion. Typically, the petty-bourgeois nationalists endeavoured to surmount the limitations of nationalism and to blend it with internationalism. A progressive Mexican leader of that time wrote that internationalism cannot exist without nationalism as its basis. There was an antagonism between them, he said, which amounted to the antagonism between aggressive philistine nationalism and the well-being of the peoples. To eliminate this antagonism and assure the right, even the existence, of weaker peoples in the face of imperialist aggression by the strong, he added, it was absolutely necessary to have a system of international cooperation.

But the abstract, classless approach of petty-bourgeois nationalists soon revealed their anti-proletarian, hegemonic

ambitions. And US imperialism made the most of this to disrupt the anti-imperialist movement from within. One of the erstwhile participants of the movement, the already quoted Haya de la Torre, urged that the Latin American liberation movement should dissociate itself from the world anti-imperialist movement. In a book, *For the Emancipation of Latin America*, which he wrote in 1927, he tried to prove that Marxism-Leninism was inapplicable in the specific conditions of his continent, pronouncing it to be a "European doctrine" and "Russian practice". He described Marxism as an outdated theory, and urged that it should be "overcome". In conclusion, he advocated a "national equivalent" of Leninism for Latin American conditions or what he termed as the "Indo-American space-time".

Seizing on the then widespread idea that Latin America must find its own Lenin, Haya de la Torre decided to come forward as the creator of an original Latin American theory and a united continental nationalist revolutionary organisation, designed to overcome the "Europeanism" of the Communist parties, and thus absorb them. José Carlos Mariátegui, founder of the Peruvian Communist Party, ridiculed Haya de la Torre and other nationalists for their stand against "the importation of European ideas" (meaning chiefly Marxism-Leninism). The founder of the Communist Party of Cuba Julio Antonio Mella, member of the CC Executive of the CP of Argentina Rodolfo Ghioldi, General Secretary of the Peruvian CP Jorge del Prado, First Secretary of the CP of Uruguay Rodney Arismendi, and others, also censured Haya de la Torre's conception for its racist overtones.

This criticism defended the independence of the political parties of the working class. And somewhat later, when the introduction of a "good-neighbour policy" opened the way for cooperation between the nationalist parties and US imperialism, it became even more apparent that this criticism was justified. Haya de la Torre and his confederates abandoned their former socialist-coloured anti-imperialist stand, and climbed on the bandwagon with anti-Soviet inventions borrowed from West European right-wing Social-Demo-

crats, accusing the USSR of state capitalism. Their national-reformist orientation became more distinct.

The fascist danger posed by Hitler's ascent to power, visibly influenced the outlook of the nationalist movement in Latin America. Some nationalist leaders exploited the rivalry between North American and German imperialism, and seized on fascist geopolitical and racist ideas. The anti-Americanism rooted in their nationalism, coupled with anti-Sovietism, drove them to fascism, camouflaged as national socialism. Young officers and petty-bourgeois intellectuals in backward Bolivia and Paraguay espoused fascism with ardour. Home-grown reactionaries and foreign monopolies were quick to see the advantages. They set out to infect the anti-imperialist movement with racism, and defused the revolutionary charge by means of army putsches portrayed as "national revolutions". The 1936 Franco mutiny in Spain added to the strength of this conservative clerical nationalism, which went to the heads of so many Latin Americans.

The growth of the Latin American agrarian-and-mining countries into agrarian-industrial countries with their own light industry as the national markets widened, resulted in an exodus of the backward rural population to the urban centres—from agriculture into light industry, handicrafts, and the swiftly expanding service industry. This mass of peasants strongly influenced by the Catholic Church, and with blind faith in the "leader", held in captivity by conservative national traditions, fairly swamped the relatively less numerous working-class element, and provided a social basis for a new eruption of nationalist sentiment, the revival of old and emergence of new nationalist parties. These, however, represented the class interests of the still emerging local capitalist class and capitalist-style landowners. But since these strata had been bred by the state sector, through that sector, their bourgeois essence was at first concealed, and they were able to strut in petty-bourgeois, even proletarian, anti-imperialist garb. At this stage, and especially after fascism was crushed in the Second World War, the nationalist parties paraded as a "third force" ostensibly equidistant from the socialist camp

and US imperialism, though in practical politics they were more than willing to do business with the latter in the hope of prospering from a third world war.

This, among others, was the case with the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (NRM) in Bolivia. Ignoring the specific forms of the Latin American countries' dependence on imperialism, blind to their place in the capitalist system, the NRM considered the continent to be part of the colonial system artificially divided into nominally independent states. They defined the social system there as feudal. And NRM leader Victor Paz Estenssoro arrived at the conclusion that the national revolution pursued three aims—anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and anti-backwardness. This latter he interpreted in a strongly nationalist spirit as “securing national grandeur and ameliorating the lot of individuals”.¹

As construed by Estenssoro, the anti-colonial and anti-feudal orientation of the revolution negated class antagonisms and asserted the primacy of national over class interests, to substantiate class cooperation as the general line. Classes and political parties, its exponents said, must learn to coexist, harmonise their interests, unite for common aims, and in so doing attach the greatest significance to the objectives of the nation.²

The political arrangement resulting from bourgeois revolutions they described as supra-class—neither bourgeois, nor proletarian. On smashing the feudal system and nationalising the mines, the revolution would set new objectives—creation of a national state, a representative system of parties, and “rule of law” that would impose an all-national discipline on all classes, including the deposed. These aims were compounded in the formula of “institutionalising the revolution” or creating a “popular nationalist state”.³ This

¹ Victor Paz Estenssoro, *La Revolución boliviana*, La Paz, 1964, p. 15.

² Guillermo Bedregal, *La Revolución boliviana. Su realidad y perspectivas dentro del ciclo de liberación de Latinoamérica*, La Paz, 1962, p. 36.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

was identified with the Maoist "new democracy".¹ By this token, the NRM ideologues paraded as exponents of "popular nationalism", maintaining that the revolution had substituted a "people's" nationalism for the "oligarchic" variety.

True, the theorists of "popular nationalism" and a supra-class state admitted that from the practical angle their way led through capitalist development (with the state encouraging the private capitalist sector) and encouragement of US capital.² Without rhyme or reason, these "legal Marxists" referred themselves to the New Economic Policy introduced in the Soviet Union in the twenties. Glossing over the class difference between the USSR and Bolivia, they tried thereby to justify their disgraceful concessions. At the same time they spread malicious anti-Soviet falsehoods. In this way, nationalism eroded the anti-imperialist and democratic elements of the NRM line, which culminated in surrender to US imperialism, causing a split and the appearance of new organisations. These declared their loyalty to the old anti-imperialist principles and styled themselves "revolutionary nationalists".

Now, a word about the peculiar racist overtones of the official nationalist NRM doctrine. Its ideologues traced Bolivia's political instability to what they called the contradiction between the Spanish form and Indian essence of the Bolivian culture and way of life. While trying to live like Europeans, they averred, Bolivians felt like Indians, wrote Spanish but thought Indian, introduced the European political system but had a mestizo policy. Therefore, the aim of these ideologues was to Americanise the European. They styled themselves "Latin American nationalists", and wrote in their programme document, "The Principles of the NRM": "We assert our faith in the power of the Indo-Mestizo race, the Bolivians' solidarity in protecting their collective interests and the common good, which they place above their own, and in the revival of autochthonous traditions... with the

¹ Ibid., p. 73.

² Ibid., p. 108.

aim of building the nation on the basis of a regime of truly Bolivian social justice."¹

This petty-bourgeois nationalist wave affected some sectors of the communist movement. The isolation of some of the Communist parties from the world communist movement as a result of the Second World War and the dissolution of the Communist International, the pernicious influence of Browderism and its accent on "American exclusiveness" and class cooperation in the name of general national aims, coupled with the pressure of the nationalist parties in power—all this had a negative effect on definite elements.

Imperialism, said José Luis Massera, member of the Central Committee Executive of the CP of Uruguay, uses a variety of strategic ploys against the liberation movement, and one of these is implanting nationalist opportunism in the working-class movement. "In our country," he said, "there is the important and unique phenomenon of Batlle² national-reformism. Its postulates obscure the class differences and the class struggle. It denies the class nature of the state. It says social progress may be achieved by simple parliamentary combinations, without struggle. It claims exclusiveness for Uruguay and maintains that the experience of other peoples is inapplicable to Uruguayan society."³

Among the people who fell prey to these ideas was Eugenio Gómez, who was then General Secretary of the Communist Party of Uruguay. He used them to foster a cult of his personality, countervailing the principles of democratic centralism with "red caudilloism" as the main trend in the Party structure. To substantiate it, he referred to the traditions of Uruguay's war of independence.

A 1955 plenary meeting of the CP of Uruguay National Committee and the Party's 16th Congress, also in 1955, exposed Gómez's bourgeois-nationalist deviation which de-

¹ M. Rolón Anaya, *Política y partidos en Bolivia*, La Paz, 1969, p. 274.

² José Batlle—President of Uruguay in 1903-07 and 1911-15. Founder of a national-reformist movement.

³ *Estudios*, Montevideo, No. 8, 1958, pp. 97-98.

liberately belittled the role of the proletarian party and the masses in the revolutionary process and aimed at subverting the Party's internationalist policy, isolating it from the world communist movement, and infecting it with anti-Sovietism.

In the Communist Party of Argentina it was Rodolfo Puiggrós and J. J. Real, with a handful of followers, who succumbed to nationalist ideas. And in 1953 a Central Committee plenary meeting exposed Real's bourgeois-nationalist posture expelling him from the Party.¹

Fighting against bourgeois-nationalist deviations and for the internationalist line, defending national interests and working for the urgent revolutionary social changes, the Communist parties of Latin America succeeded in sharply augmenting their ranks, and elaborated new tactics suiting the rise of the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement.

But as time went on, there appeared nationalist groups that attacked the Communist parties from ultra-left positions. Douglas Bravo's group in Venezuela, for example, said: "Our movement is not confined to the narrow framework of any definite doctrine. It reflects the broad doctrine of the liberation of Venezuela. The liberation of Venezuela in the present stage is a continuation of the liberation struggle begun by Simón Bolívar in 1810. It is its final point."²

This tirade is distinctly nationalist, because the liberation movement of today is certainly not a direct continuation of the war of independence fought under Bolívar either in aims or objectives, the alignment of class forces, the direction of the main blow or the means and techniques of struggle. The ultra-left ideologues deliberately overlook the international conditions of the movement in Venezuela, and draw groundless parallels between the United States and Spain. They forget that the United States is the personification of the capi-

¹ V. Codovilla, *Una trayectoria consecuente en la lucha por la liberación nacional y social del pueblo argentino*, Vol. 3, Buenos Aires, 1964.

² *Punto Final*, Santiago de Chile, No. 33, 1967, Suplemento, p. 7.

talist system, whereas Spain was a backward feudal monarchy. They forget that the class nature and form of dependence on Spain in the 15th-19th centuries, and the dependence on the United States in the 20th, are poles apart. True, they recognise Cuba as "the advance detachment of revolutionary Latin America", but interpret this incontrovertible fact in a geopolitical spirit (antinomy of Latin America and the USA) rather than in the context of the struggle between the capitalist and socialist systems. Exposing the US imperialist designs of crushing revolutionary Cuba, the 1969 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties said: "But the courageous people of Cuba, led by their Communist Party and supported by the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, progressive forces of Latin America and the entire revolutionary movement, staunchly defend their sovereignty and freedom and thereby the outpost of socialism in the American continent."¹ And that is the true Marxist-Leninist class appraisal, which nullifies the nationalist geopolitical interpretation.

Bravo's nationalism is peculiarly laced with national nihilism. He calls for a united Latin-American republic. "The great republic of Latin America," he says, "has a population of 220 million or greater than that of North America. The people of this great republic have a common history, nearly the same language, the same customs, and similar habits. The ethnic composition is nearly the same throughout Latin America: Indians, whites and Negroes. From Mexico to Patagonia its people have almost the same idiosyncrasy. They experience the same economic difficulties, have the same faith, and suffer equally from economic and cultural backwardness. And they have the same enemy—the oligarchy and imperialism."² It is quite true that the peoples of Latin America have the same enemy—imperialism, first of all US imperialism. But it is not an exclusively Latin

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 14.

² *Punto Final*, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

American enemy. And it does not separate the Latin American peoples from the world-wide anti-imperialist front. On the contrary, it constitutes a compelling reason for them to participate in this great front. As for the oligarchy, its social nature, relation to power, and forms of association with US imperialism differ from country to country, as repeatedly stressed by Fidel Castro, the Prime Minister of Cuba.¹ Consequently, the matter requires a concrete historical approach.

Economic and cultural backwardness is not a specifically Latin American problem either. Therefore, approaching it from the standpoint of the world revolutionary process, we should consider the different class content, different balance of class forces, and different national forms of revolution in the various Latin American countries. The ethnic and linguistic similarity, the similarity of the historical process and the psychological make-up are not an absolute. And to make an absolute of them, as we see from the aforesaid, is to construct yet another myth petty-bourgeois revolutionists like to use as a means for organising society.

Latin America is inhabited by peoples speaking different variants of Spanish, Portuguese, French, English and Dutch, and also many different Indian languages. Indian peoples and ethnic groups comprise approximately 10 per cent of its population. And if we take the Latin American nations one by one, we shall also see that they are not homogeneous either racially or psychologically. People of the Negroid race make up something like nine per cent of the Latin American population, and direct descendants of white colonists 10-15 per cent. Nor is there any distinct similarity between the histories of such disparate countries as, say, Brazil and Costa Rica, Haiti and Peru, Argentina and Guyana. This is why exponents of petty-bourgeois revolutionism project this identity into the future.

Bravo's national nihilism in relation to the Latin American countries blends grotesquely with a national avant-gardism in the case of Venezuela. "The Venezuelan revolution," he

¹ *Granma*, Havana, April 23, 1970.

says, "is the spearhead aimed against North American imperialism. Once it will have gathered strength, developed and turned into a victorious revolution, it will give the start to the liberation of the other peoples of Latin America."¹ For the sake of accuracy it should be recalled that this process has already started with the victorious Cuban revolution. And besides being immodest, Bravo's claim is unscholarly and contrary to fact. Furthermore, he ignores the law of the uneven economic and political development of countries in the epoch of imperialism and the world-wide transition from capitalism to socialism. There is absolutely no justification for drawing comparisons between this process and the war of independence fought by Spain's American colonies in the early 19th century, and no justification either for expecting it to be simultaneous and rapid in all the Latin American countries.

The nationalist contortions of ultra-left petty-bourgeois groups have become more conspicuous in the present stage, because of the support they get from Mao's great-power nationalist and divisive group, on the one hand, and the encouragement of the US imperialists, who hope to exploit them for splitting the communist movement in Latin America, to disrupt the anti-imperialist front from within, on the other. When Edwin Martin was US Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, he admitted that the ruling elements were banking on the "factionalism" of the communist movement in Latin America.² The local bourgeoisie supports nationalist, ultra-left and right-revisionist factionalisms, which are often quite undistinguishable from each other.³ This is why the Communist parties in Latin America are laying the accent on internationalist education, and coming to grips with bourgeois-nationalist conceptions.

The Party programme approved by the 14th Congress of the Communist Party of Chile describes struggle against

¹ *Punto Final*, op. cit., p. 4.

² Rodger Swearingen (ed.), *Focus: World Communism. Authoritative Analyses and Key Documents*, N. Y., 1964, p. 366.

³ *Comunidad*, Asunción, No. 599, June 1969.

nationalism, a manifestation of opportunism in the liberation movement, as a crucial ideological assignment. "Equipped with the victorious weapon of Marxism-Leninism," it says, "our Party considers it the main task to intensify the offensive from fundamental Marxist-Leninist positions against bourgeois ideology, which is cloaked in diverse new forms, thereby concealing its bankruptcy. And in this effort to explain the truth, the Party must also come to grips with various opportunist trends—the right trends, like revisionism and nationalism, and the "left" trends, like dogmatism, sectarianism and adventurism."¹

The Communist Party of Argentina continues to fight against the "nationalist pestilence" in the ranks of the anti-imperialist liberation movement of Latin America.²

The Latin American Communist parties have taken a firm stand against chauvinist hysteria and internecine warfare on the continent, inspired by imperialist quarters and local reaction.

The first issue of *Boucan*, the newspaper of the United Party of Haitian Communists, carried a special article against the racist demagoguery of the Duvalier family, entitled, "What Is Black Is Not All Revolutionary", describing the so-called cultural nationalism as the result of a "false political perspective". "Cultural" nationalists have set out to revive the ancient African culture to oppose it to modern culture and block access to ideas of freedom, to crush political opposition. This, in the ultimate analysis, is equivalent to the attitude of the reactionary nationalists, who expel white racists only to step into their shoes and oppress their own people.

The 6th Conference of the Communist parties of Central America, Mexico and Panama (November 1969), drew attention to the profit derived from nationalist sentiments by US imperialism and local reaction. "We appeal to all progres-

¹ *XIV Congreso Nacional del Partido Comunista de Chile*, Vol. 3, Santiago, 1969, p. 19.

² *La peste nacionalista. En defensa del marxismo-leninismo*, Buenos Aires, 1968, pp. 84-87.

sive forces in Central America, especially to the peoples of Honduras and Salvador, to understand this serious danger and work for unity in the struggle for democracy, independence, social progress and the well-being of the people. The time has come to counter the ruling classes, which are trying to sow hatred between peoples in their own foul interests, to divide them and thereby carry out their plans of exploiting the peoples and serving US imperialism."¹

As an alternative to the crisis-stricken Central American economic integration, the Conference urged democratic unity based on profound revolutionary socio-economic and political changes assuring the region's development and laying the foundations for fraternal friendship and lasting peace among the peoples.

The Conference of Latin American Communist and Workers' parties in December 1969 was also devoted to coordinating the action of Communists and all Latin American revolutionary anti-imperialist forces on the basis of proletarian internationalism in the struggle against US imperialism, the common enemy.

This is how, faithful to the decisions of the 1969 Moscow Meeting rallying all anti-imperialist forces, the Communists of Latin America are countering the class enemy's attempts to use bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism for disrupting the liberation movement.

¹ *La Voz de México*, December 2, 1969.

CHAPTER IX

THE AFRO-ASIAN NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT AND NATIONALISM

1. General Description of National Movements and Nationalism in Non-Socialist Asian Countries

National movements as we know them today did not arise in Asia until a century after America.

The awakening of national consciousness in the other colonial and semi-colonial Asian countries began at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, impelled by the intensification of colonial exploitation in the imperialist epoch and the introduction there of the capitalist mode of production. It grew under the impact of the 1905-1907 revolution in Russia, and then the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Unlike most of the European and American countries, the capitalist mode of production shaped in Asian countries in a setting of colonial dependence, and in connection with the division of labour predominantly in the world capitalist market. This held up the emergence of a national bourgeoisie and its conversion from a "class in itself" into "a class for itself". In many countries, in fact, the bourgeoisie took form as a class later than the proletariat. Furthermore, it consisted at first of merchants and usurers, and scions of landowning families. The most influential among them was the pro-imperialist compradore section, which had a stake in maintaining the exclusiveness of local markets and the colonial status. The varied ethnic composition of the colonies, their borders demarcated to suit the strategic and economic interests of the colonial powers, resulted in that the bourgeoisie gave priority to religious rather than national factors, thus camou-

flaging the capitalist essence of the new relations of production. These were embellished with the traditional and time-hallowed caste and guild adornments.

But unlike Europe and America, national consciousness began to shape in most Asian countries long before nations as such were fully formed. This was a natural reaction of the exploited to foreign imperialist oppression. In the semi-colonies (the Ottoman Empire and China) the national movements were initially directed against despotic and alien regimes; in China, for example, against the yoke of the Manchu dynasty, culminating in the 1911 revolution. In the Ottoman Empire there was a variety of national movements. The discontent of the Turkish (aristocrat) intelligentsia and capitalist merchants with the venal and despotic Abdul Hamid regime held up by Circassian mercenaries, built up into the Young Turk revolution of 1908. Meanwhile, the Arab peoples aspiring to autonomy began to resist Turkisation. But though the 1908 revolution in Turkey and the 1911 revolution in China deposed ethnically alien regimes, neither succeeded in ending the semi-colonial status. This showed clearly that foreign imperialism was the main enemy.

The national movements in Eastern and Southern Europe and in Ireland influenced the appearance of national consciousness among the Asian colonial and semi-colonial peoples. But the greatest impact was made by the 1905-1907 and 1917 revolutions in Russia. The October Socialist Revolution, which stimulated an unprecedented upswing of anti-imperialist sentiment in Asia, was in fact the beginning of the crisis of the imperialist colonial system.

The formation of nations and states gained impetus. But as the times were not of ascendant capitalism, but rather of transition from capitalism to socialism, there was naturally a specific quality to the new nations and the national movement as a whole.

The formation of new states on the ruins of former multinational colonies occurred, with but a few exceptions, within the old colonial territorial frameworks. As a result, many ethnic and national communities were broken up and new

ones came into being. Many of these new communities were not closely knit by either economic ties or a common language. The ethnic aspect was obscured by the political, by the factor of statehood and territorial integrity. Political concentration occurred in the absence of mature economic conditions for it. The common civic arrangement was not national, and was often served by a foreign tongue, in many cases that of the former metropolitan country.

Due to the immaturity and small numbers of the proletariat, and the weakness of the local bourgeoisie, it was petty-bourgeois groups and intellectuals who assumed leadership over the formation of this new political community. And if the country took the capitalist road, entering the world capitalist market, the intelligentsia (civic and military), the so-called functional groups, gave birth to a specific bourgeois stratum mostly known as the bureaucratic bourgeoisie. And since the strongly religious peasants and marginal urban strata (the poor) were the main social base of the national movements, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie exploited the religious aspect to buttress the political community, the state, and also to disguise its egoistic class interests. This is why nationalism gave precedence not to the ethnic side, but to the religious and political, thus concealing class interests with communal, guild and religious motivations.

The people's yearning for social justice, whetted by the example of the socialist states, was kept down by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie with demagogic talk about a "national type" socialism, a concept that rests on the self-professed national exclusiveness of the Eastern peoples, hyperbolising the peculiarity of their histories, declaring them socially homogeneous, claiming absence of class distinctions and antagonisms, extolling the traditional economic and social patterns, and appealing for support to religious dogma. The philosophical basis of "national" socialism is usually drawn from the widespread religions and beliefs.

In the East, therefore, utopian socialism as a structural component of nationalism should not be regarded as a sign of its progressive orientation. Socialist ideas are not always

used for progressive ends, and are in such cases anything but beneficial for the people. Analysing the progressive socialist ideas in Europe in the mid-19th century, Marx and Engels also showed how the bourgeoisie is liable to use them for its narrow class purposes. For example, they exposed feudal and philistine socialism. Today in the East, too, various classes try to exploit socialist ideas for their specific interests. Reactionary classes give them a reactionary content, which they camouflage with nationalism.

Landlords and the bourgeoisie appeal to the religious feelings of peasants and other working people in order to win them to their side in fighting foreign imperialism and to disguise class antagonisms with religious-nationalist ideas.

Religious dogma is used to substantiate the messianic idea of a chosen people, of its exclusiveness, and counterposes religion to the "corrupting Western materialism". It is also often invoked to create Oriental racist conceptions. This nationalist-religious approach helps nationalist theoreticians to negate the validity for their countries of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on class struggle.

The patriarchal character of the class structure, hatred of imperialist oppressors, and petty-bourgeois peasant illusions combine to create fertile soil for utopian socialism dressed in nationalist costume.

And since the Asian national movements arose in colonies and semi-colonies with a varied national and ethnic background, many of their leaders, due to social immaturity, tended to confuse nationalism with national ideology and to regard it as a means for replacing the fragmented colony or semi-colony with a new centralised (multinational) state, that is, as the only possible instrument for performing a national revolution.

This was how Sun Yat-sen conceived the "national principle" in his "Three Principles of the People" in 1905, and also when he founded the National Party (Kuomintang) in 1912. At that time he regarded the "national principle" as the motive for deposing the alien Manchu dynasty and re-

storing a centralised Chinese state. His views had definite supra-class overtones and contained elements of Han chauvinism. "The past revolutions," Sun Yat-sen said, "were revolutions of heroes, whereas the present one is being performed by the entire nation. The term 'national revolution' means that all people in the country are inspired by the ideas of freedom, equality and fraternity, and everyone considers it a duty to participate in the revolution."

Sun Yat-sen saw the "nation" as an eternal and biological, rather than historical concept. In so doing he confused it with "race". His view of the large population of China, its old cultural traditions, was often chauvinistic. For him the Chinese nation was superior to all others.

But as a democrat Sun Yat-sen understood that the national revolution must transcend "racial" frameworks. He showed deep compassion to all working people, all exploited. This is why he complemented the "national principle" with the principles of "people's rule" (a democratic republic) and "people's well-being" (equal rights to land with the rent going to the state).

Under the influence of the October Revolution, Sun Yat-sen revised the "Three Principles". The "national principle" became distinctly anti-imperialist, while the "people's rule" principle became critical of bourgeois parliamentary democracy and urged people's participation in government. To the "Three Principles" were added the "Three Political Guidelines"—alliance with the Soviet Union, alliance with the Communist Party of China, and support for the worker-peasant struggle. In other words, as conceived by Sun Yat-sen, nationalism acquired a distinctly anti-imperialist, revolutionary content, and reflected the interests of the masses. The conservative and, in the final analysis reactionary, essence of nationalism was pushed back. But the logic of the class struggle, as in other countries, proved the vincibility of the democratic and revolutionary elements in the content of Chinese nationalism. The bourgeois leaders of the Kuomintang rejected its revolutionary interpretation and tried to drag the country on the capitalist path.

The same tendencies were seen in Indonesia. There, the "feudal nationalism" of the 17th-19th centuries was expressive of the interests of the local feudals, who wanted to keep their feudal states independent in the face of colonial aggression. The struggle against the colonial invaders was headed by patriotic feudal lords, whose anti-colonialist slogans aroused the peasants.

Not until the latter half of the 19th century, however, was the country's national integrity properly apprehended, resulting in the appearance of the concepts "Insulind" and "Indonesia", first used by European explorers, and only later, during the first imperialist world war, and especially in the twenties, by leaders of the national movement.

Parties with members of different ethnic origin began to appear in the country. A Communist party was founded. So were bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. One of the latter espoused religious nationalism as a successor to feudal nationalism. The other parties, however, were aware that religious nationalism militated against the anti-colonial struggle, and that the nation had to rise above the narrow interests of the hostile religious communities.

The programme of the National Party, adopted at its first congress in 1928, envisaged "achievement of political independence, that is, termination of Dutch rule". It urged "national awareness and sense of unity". Ties between the Asian peoples were defined in the programme not in an Asiatic spirit but an anti-colonial spirit, as a vehicle for joint struggle against imperialism. What the party's leaders called nationalism, was in substance a plea for unity for the sake of independence.

In his well-known speech on July 1, 1945, Sukarno, leader of the National Party, described nationalism as struggle for an integrated state. At that time it was directed against separatism and attempts by the Japanese colonial authorities to dismember the country. Sukarno's slogan was "freedom or death". "We must never say," he declared, "that the Indonesian nation is the best and the most glorious, belittling other nations."

After independence, a bloc of national-bourgeois elements assumed leadership. The "Political Manifesto of the Indonesian Republic" (known as Manipol), that is, President Sukarno's speech of August 17, 1959 on the introduction of so-called directed democracy, was a concentrated exposition of the bloc's political creed, proclaimed the official ideology of the country in November 1960.

The Manifesto reposed on the idea that all social strata had the same wishes, interests, and aims. It portrayed the ancient concept of "mutual cooperation" (Gotong-Rojong) as a specifically Indonesian trait of character. The state built on this fundamental principle was depicted as supra-class, while the socialist stage of the revolution was conceived as the development of "national unity" against imperialism and feudalism. The unity of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal forces was said to be a directly socialist development.

The liberalism of bourgeois democracy was rejected not for class but for nationalist motives, because it was "imported" and did not fit the national make-up of the Indonesian people. The idea of proletarian dictatorship was rejected for the same reason. And the unity of the main political movements, their solidarity on a nationalist basis, was termed "Nasakom", that is, unity of the nationalist, religious and communist forces.

The counter-revolutionary forces gradually emasculated the general democratic elements of this ideology. The idea of "directed democracy" was used to strengthen the capitalist bureaucracy (civic and military) and the bourgeoisified landowners in the government and the national economy. When they felt sufficiently strong, they wiped out the trimmings of "directed democracy", the anti-imperialist slogans, and installed a terrorist dictatorship.

Nationalism has done untold damage to the communist movement, too, for it sacrificed the fundamental class interests of the working class in the name of a spurious "national unity". This cut the ground from under the liberation movement, and finally brought about the national tragedy of 1965.

The "Appeal of the Marxist-Leninist Group of the Communist Party of Indonesia" (1967) says that the "thesis of the priority of national interests over class interests, the attempts to subordinate the Party Programme to the Political Manifesto, the United National Front to the Nasakom Alliance, the attempts to 'make Marxism the property of the nation'—all this is but a reflection of how deeply petty-bourgeois ideology became rooted in the body of our Party".

Due to the far-gone class differentiation in Burma and India, the revolutionary democratic forces there were aware of the reactionary essence of nationalism (though the term was used) and of the necessity to blend anti-imperialism with internationalism.

U Aung San, Burmese revolutionary democrat and national hero, said: "I am for nationalism so long as it nourishes our love for our people and other peoples, or at least does not foster hatred of others. I am for it so long as it imbues us with the sense of national and social justice, prompting us to fight against oppression and tyranny at home and the rest of the world. And I hate imperialism, whether British, Japanese or Burmese."

The feudal reactionaries in India, who have joined hands with local monopoly groups and foreign imperialism, have given an entirely different, certainly not humane, twist to the concept of "nationalism". In India it was bred on a religious basis (Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist) and was used extensively by the British against the national liberation movement. After political independence and the establishment of two states—India and Pakistan—the reactionary content of religious nationalism became especially obvious.

The theorists of communal nationalism identify nationalism with the Hindu religion, whose exponents they declare to be a single nation. They preach religious and racial discrimination and forcible assimilation. The guru M. S. Golwalkar, leader of the fascist terrorist organisation Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and an admirer of Hitler, wrote: "The non-Hindu population of Hindustan must adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to appreciate the Hindu

religion, must reject all other aspirations but those of glorifying the Hindu race and culture." When the organisation was officially banned, its most active members founded another party, Bhattacharija Jan Sangh (League of the Hindu People) in 1951, denying rights to national minorities and exploiting the religious strife between Hindus and Muslims, which they described as the axis of the country's history. The League's social base is the merchant bourgeoisie, artisans, the reactionary section of civil servants and intellectuals, and the feudal elements in the village.

"Local nationalism", espoused by the religious organisations Akali Dal in Punjab and Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam in Madras, is also fairly widespread. This is due to India's multinational character. While progressives, first of all the Communists, are working for democratic national integration based on a real equality of all peoples and satisfying their objective development needs, "local" nationalists resist integration and conceal the selfish aims of local capitalist and propertied interests with hysterical anti-communist slogans.

The communal parties regard socialism as "hostile to the spirit of Indian culture" and Communists as the "main enemy". They oppose India's independent foreign policy and want to involve her in pro-imperialist military blocs.

Here is what communal nationalism amounts to politically: preference for private property and individualism as allegedly traditional national features of the "Hindu world"; hostility to progressive social change, and perpetuation of caste privileges and medieval obscurantism.

The so-called Muslim nationalism in neighbouring Pakistan is just as reactionary. It is a screen for the big Punjab capitalists and landlords, who have involved their country in imperialist military blocs. Muslim nationalism was exploited by Yahya Khan's military dictatorship to suppress the national liberation struggle of the people of Bangladesh, and to subdue the national minorities in the North-West Province. It is an instrument for suppressing the class struggle of the working class, and for outlawing democratic parties and organisations.

This is evidence of the complexity and contradictory nature of nationalism's social role in the major non-socialist Asian countries. By definition, it may be divided into feudal, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism. Each works in the interests of definite classes and strata, which infuse it with conservative, reformist, radical or democratic revolutionary elements. The various forms of nationalism (e.g., Muslim nationalism, "philosophy of the Arab essence", Indonesian nationalism of the "simple people") evolutionise, assuming a different class content.

Since the national liberation movement in Asia is increasingly a movement for social liberation, and since many of the peoples there have opted for the socialist orientation, the exploiting classes are trying to use the nationalist slogan of "national integration" to protect their privileges, put their countries on the capitalist road, and preserve their economic, social and political grip. Though the slogan is still essentially anti-imperialist, the bourgeoisie interprets it more and more as a slogan of "class peace", which assures its privileges.

The anti-imperialist struggle for social and national emancipation gives rise to a polarisation of classes, each of which uses nationalism in its own way. As a result, utopian and petty-bourgeois socialist ideas often acquire nationalist overtones.

The Asian Communist parties are aware of this antithesis. They take guidance in the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the Soviet solution of the national question, especially national development in Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, and in the experience of the world communist movement. Lenin's address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, which outlined the problems and their solutions for Asia, has been of great help. Describing the Communists' attitude to nationalism in Eastern countries, Lenin said: "The task is to arouse the working masses to revolutionary activity, to independent action and to organisation, regardless of the level they have reached; to translate the true communist doctrine, which was

intended for the Communists of the more advanced countries, into the language of every people; to carry out those practical tasks which must be carried out immediately, and to join the proletarians of other countries in a common struggle.

"Such are the problems whose solution you will not find in any communist book, but will find in the common struggle begun by Russia. You will have to tackle that problem and solve it through your own independent experience. In that you will be assisted, on the one hand, by close alliance with the vanguard of the working people of other countries, and, on the other, by ability to find the right approach to the peoples of the East whom you here represent. You will have to base yourselves on the bourgeois nationalism which is awakening, and must awaken, among those peoples, and which has its historical justification."¹ The democratic elements of nationalism, rooted chiefly among peasants and directed against foreign oppression and medieval custom, Lenin explained, require support. In the political approach of the Communists in Eastern countries this necessitates alignment of the general communist theory and practice to a peculiar environment, "in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism".²

Communists in Eastern countries have to guard against sectarian attitudes towards the nationalism of oppressed nations. But they also must guard against liquidationist tendencies, which may substitute nationalist ideology for proletarian internationalism. The danger of nationalist contamination has become particularly great in view of the hegemonic and divisive activity of the Maoists.

Communists in the non-socialist Asian countries support the anti-imperialist element of national movements. They support their patriotic and democratic traditions, but invariably call attention to the dangers of chauvinism, showing that it may be used by foreign imperialism and local reac-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

² *Ibid.*, p. 161.

tion. The Communist Party of India, for example, says in its Rules that a Party member must conduct himself in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and the lofty traditions, history and cultural legacy of the Indian people. The political resolution of the Seventh CPI Congress, and also the Programme it adopted, stress that foreign imperialism and domestic reaction take advantage of nationalism and chauvinism to disrupt national unity and encourage separatist tendencies.

The Indian Communists are working for deep-going national democratic changes, including a democratic solution of the national question. This would go a long way in preventing reaction from exploiting communal, tribal and caste strife.

The Communist Party of Ceylon, too, publicly exposed British imperialism's use of chauvinist and cosmopolitan currents among the local bourgeoisie to goad the island's ethnic groups against each other, and to subvert the anti-imperialist movement.

Speaking at the International Symposium on the Centenary of Lenin's Birth, De Silva, one of the leaders of the CP of Ceylon, said:

"The rise of nationalism results to one or another extent in the propagation of national isolation and chauvinism. Acting under the banner of nationalism, the bourgeoisie, including the petty bourgeoisie, opposes patriotism to proletarian internationalism, sows racial and religious discord, thus stunting the struggle of the masses for social progress. In its separatist actions, the bourgeoisie demagogically uses patriotic slogans, calls for struggle to preserve national culture, national traditions, and the like. All this compels the Marxists-Leninists in our country to conduct counter-propaganda, and to energetically defend proletarian internationalism."

In the Arab countries, Communist parties are working for the unity of the revolutionary patriotic forces, strengthening the progressive regimes, and seeking to eliminate the political influence of the imperialist powers. First and foremost, of course, their efforts are centred on eliminating the consequences of the Israeli aggression.

Speaking of the progressive democratic character of the Arab liberation movement, Youssef Khattar El-Helou, a leader of the Lebanese Communist Party, said: "The working class must play a prominent role in the Arab revolutionary movement both in the national and social contexts. The Arab Communist parties must not permit chauvinism to spread in their countries."

Communists in Asia note that nationalist tendencies isolate the national liberation forces from the world revolutionary movement and the socialist community. This dooms the anti-imperialist struggle to failure, as we have seen in Malaya, Thailand, the Philippines, and other Asian countries where the Maoists succeeded in imposing their nationalist postures.

In its message to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, for example, the Communist Party of the Philippines said that one of the main reasons for its defeat in the armed struggle of the fifties was self-isolation from the world communist movement. Our experience, it said, confirms the conclusion of the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that a liberation movement will not be successful, unless it is in close alliance with the socialist countries, the international working class, and national liberation movements in other countries.

Communist parties in the Asian countries are doing their utmost to keep out nationalism, and are fighting for proletarian internationalism.

2. The National Liberation Movement and Nationalism in Africa

The nationalism seen in the national liberation movements of Africa is highly varied. The social, economic, historical and political development differs from region to region. So does the degree of maturity of the different national formations. Differences in ethnic composition, traditions, religions and beliefs, the number of European settlers, etc., are also considerable.

**Features
of Nationalism
in Africa**

The nationalism in Northern Africa is substantially different from that in Tropical Africa or in the former Portuguese colonies, or South Africa. Some differences are due to the different types of colonialism—the French (with the accent on assimilation and centralised government), the British (with indirect government through tribal chiefs), and the Belgian (with its paternalistic policy).

Furthermore, the nationalism in the Arab countries of Africa, especially Northern Africa, contains many features of the Mid-Eastern Arab nationalism.

But apart from the distinctions, nationalism in Africa also has some common features.

Certain African ideologues allege a fundamental difference between “European nationalism” and “African nationalism”. Writing in the *Dakar-Matin*, a Senegalese newspaper, in 1969, Babacar Ba described European nationalism as “aggressive and chauvinist”. “In the underdeveloped countries generally, and especially in our small African countries, on the other hand,” he wrote, “the case is entirely different. Our nationalism is necessarily peaceful, directed entirely on the concrete tasks of development. Its characteristics distinguish it from the European nationalism of the 19th and 20th centuries.”¹

This is clear evidence of the author’s own nationalist approach. He portrays African nationalism as superior to other, negative nationalisms.

Yet the past decade abounded in conflicts between neighbouring African states and in displays of nationalist and tribal sentiment. The bloodshed in Nigeria is a tragic case of the separatist nationalism existing in Africa.

True, the onus of responsibility falls on international imperialism. The Theses of the CC CPSU on the Centenary of Lenin’s Birth stressed: “International imperialism organises counter-revolutionary putsches, supports anti-popular military dictatorships, incites nationalism and separatism, and

¹ Babacar Ba, “Nationalisme et coopération internationale” in *Dakar-Matin*, April 22, 1969.

tries to paralyse progressive tendencies." This would not be possible if definite nationalist and separatist forces in Africa itself were effectively neutralised.

The essence of nationalism is the same everywhere. But it is a mistake to ignore the differences in its social-class content and *modus operandi*, which depend on the concrete historical situation and the social-economic environment.

The forms of nationalism in Africa, and to some extent its content, are in certain ways different from those of European nationalism.

They differ from the bourgeois nationalism of Western Europe in the 14th-17th centuries not only in time; the socio-economic conditions in which they appeared are also different.

In Europe bourgeois nationalism matured when the national productive forces were already quite considerable, during the formation of a national bourgeoisie and of nations. In fact, the bourgeoisie was the main bearer and advocate of nationalist ideas, directed against feudalism.

In Africa the birth and development of nationalism followed a different course. The national productive forces were not in a state of growth. Their development was being artificially retarded. So, in a way, it was a reaction to imperialist exploitation and colonial enslavement.

There were no fully-formed nations either in the pre-colonial period or the period of colonial rule. It was imperialism that involved the primitive communal economies of many parts of Africa in the world capitalist economy, making them an adjunct of the more developed European economy. Imperialist exploitation delayed the emergence of internal national markets, national economies, the national bourgeoisie, and nations.

In Western Europe, as we know, nationalism had a cultural and linguistic basis, and, still more important, the basis of economic community. In Africa and Asia, on the other hand, it grew in the common political struggle against foreign oppressors.

As a result, nationalism in Africa is part of the national liberation revolution. This is exploited by capitalists for class purposes. They deliberately identify the national liberation revolution with nationalism, and the notion "national" with "nationalist". Playing on national feelings, extolling the African identity and "exclusiveness", they try to emasculate the national liberation movement of revolutionary content and to dissociate it from the other streams of the world revolutionary movement.

Imperialist oppression has given African nationalism its anti-imperialist and anti-foreign orientation. And it often combines with racism. True, there was also an element of racism in the European bourgeois nationalism, but this less in its early stages. It did not surface until the era of colonial conquests. In Africa, the reaction to white racism has been part of nationalism from the moment of its birth. Whereas European nationalism was directed against the national past, the nationalism in Africa draws on the past, on national traditions, which it idealises.

Lastly, African nationalism has an incomparably more powerful antagonist: imperialism. And the background to the battle against it was colonial chauvinism and racism.

Nationalism could not play so prominent a part in ideology and politics, either in the past or now, if the mass of the African population were not psychologically attuned to nationalist slogans and programmes.

Let us glance back at the main formative stages of nationalism in Africa.

The Birth of Nationalism in Africa

Certainly, the birth of nationalism could not be simultaneous and identical in the various parts of Africa. In the socially and economically more developed Northern Africa, pan-Arabic and Islamic movements appeared at the dawn of the century, whereas in Tropical Africa the nationalist movements are much younger.

But despite the differences, African nationalism was on the whole in the stage of "embryonic development" right up to the end of the Second World War. There was no organised

or mature nationalist movement. Neither was there any mature nationalist ideology. And in the conditions of colonial dependence it was unthinkable for nationalism to flourish in government and social practice.

In reference to the late 19th and early 20th centuries it would probably be right to speak of a psychological reaction of the enslaved African peoples to the racism of European colonialists. But over the many decades of colonial rule there was a slow and painful process: the forming of the national consciousness of millions upon millions of Africans.

They began to understand that they were being plundered and humiliated. They began to understand that their human dignity was being abused, that they were being exploited. By whom? By the white intruder. A suppressed resentment grew against whites in general, and in the French colonies against the French; in the British colonies against the English, in the Belgian colonies against Belgians, etc.

We might say, therefore, that nationalism in Africa grew in the psychology as a protest of the exploited African peoples against their European oppressors.

This rising nationalism contained positive elements—first of all, its anti-imperialist orientation, protest against oppression, and aspirations to equality and justice.

Outbreaks of anger often developed into spontaneous action brutally suppressed by the colonial authorities. Mostly, it was a reaction to the "white racism" of the European colonists, in some cases clothed in religious garb.

A protest also matured among the small number of African intellectuals, some of whom saw no other alternative but to emigrate. Ideologues like Marcus Garvey and George Padmore came forward with pan-African and Negritude ideas.

Nationalism as a relatively consummate ideology, with a corresponding practice, dates from that stage of the general crisis of capitalism when the imperialist colonial system began to break up in face of the influence of the world socialist system.

The favourable international post-war situation stimulated the national liberation movement, directed by political par-

ties and organisations whose ideology expressed the common national interests of the oppressed African countries.

In these nationalist concepts relatively progressive democratic and anti-imperialist elements were interwoven in bizarre fashion with the reactionary factors contained in all varieties of nationalism as a world outlook that places the national principle above all else. The anti-imperialist element originated from the objective course and content of the national liberation movement. But in the underdeveloped and distorted consciousness this social-economic class content of the liberation processes took the form of a contradiction between all Blacks and all whites, between the indigenous people of Africa and foreigners. This was fertile soil for nationalism. The specific features of the African continent were raised to an absolute. They became the starting point for claims to exclusiveness. The sound wish to revive national culture, reviled by the colonialists, grew into an ideology that segregated African civilisation from the rest of the world. In other words, national elements were turned into distinctly nationalist.

A new stage began in the mid-1950s—transition to struggle for political independence.

This change was reflected first in the ideological platform, policy and practice of African political organisations.

Some parties cultivated a nationalist hostility towards everything foreign. The propaganda against colonialism and imperialism accentuated the fact that the oppressors were foreign, primarily white. In other words, racist arguments were used to fight white racism. Also, the role of progressives in the metropolitan countries was treated lightly. One of the fashionable "theories" was that the West European proletariat was going bourgeois.

And due to the prevailing psychology these concepts fell on receptive ears. Suspicion of whites became widespread. Nationalist propaganda and local art and literature cultivated stereotyped notions of noble, sensitive and kind "Blacks", and cruel, dishonest, greedy "whites". And with

the low level of culture and education, these ideas were quickly accepted.

Anti-imperialist propaganda contained numerous references to Africa's past history, often unjustifiably glorified. The anti-communist tendency, too, which had surfaced earlier in the pan-African movement, continued to gain ground.

To pinpoint the specific features of African nationalism at that particular stage, we would do well to examine some of the ploys of the African elite to mobilise millions of illiterate and dispossessed people psychologically attuned to action against foreign oppression.

At that time, the simplest and most vulgar nationalism verging on racism was the most effective in rallying the masses against the overseas oppressors. In the absence of stable economic links between different regions of the continent, and also within each region, it was easier at a definite phase of the liberation movement to coordinate the struggle of the African masses by drawing attention to external characteristics—Blacks are oppressed, and whites are their common enemy—rather than the substance of imperialist exploitation.

White racism was an important aspect, for it was in evidence all the time, everywhere, insulting the national pride and dignity of the Africans (the race barrier, the staggering difference between the living standards of Europeans and Africans, and the arrogance of the colonial authorities).

In the late fifties, and especially in 1960, the great majority of the African colonies and dependencies gained political independence. As a result, nationalism underwent an evolution. Ambroise Padanou Agboton, prefect of a department in Dahomey, wrote: "A factor of progress throughout the period of the heroic liberation struggle, nationalism presents a distinct danger of regression when it becomes a factor of isolation or when it degenerates into an instrument of mystification for enslaving and exploiting the popular masses after independence.

"Indeed, if national independence is a means, then political, economic and social emancipation of the masses is the

supreme and immediate aim of every authentic independence. Consequently, the simple change of the exploiter's nationality is not enough for exploitation to become an object of popular sovereignty any more than for tyranny to become national for it to cease to be tyrannical."¹

On achieving political independence, Africa faced new horizons.

Political independence became that new change in quality which set off far-reaching evolutions in the social content and external forms of nationalism in Africa.

**Typical Features
of Nationalism
in Africa Today**

Ideologically, it ceased to be all-African. More, it ceased to be the ideological expression of the interests of the masses even in the individual countries.

However, some varieties did retain anti-imperialist and anti-colonial elements.

Before independence, nationalism was manifest chiefly in public thinking, ideology, and political struggle. At present, it is increasingly manifest in social policy and practice, especially in the domain of national development.

Independent African states are confronted with problems of attaining economic sovereignty. More and more, nationalism intrudes into the theory and practice of such economic problems as accumulation, development of the state sector, use of foreign aid, and industrialisation.

In politics, nationalism manifests itself in relation to the world communist movement and progressive African political parties. It is also more frequently in evidence in the relations between African states, especially territorial disputes and border issues.

Present-day nationalism in Africa is closely connected with the formation of nationalities and nations, large ethnic groups, upon a common linguistic, cultural and economic foundation. This leads to an unjustified exaggeration of national factors and gives impulse to a shift to nationalist positions.

¹ *Afrique nouvelle*, June 27-July 3, 1968.

Nationalism in Africa was and remains a "personalised" nationalism, that is, a nationalism revolving round the personality of the leader. True, nationalist theory is disseminated by the ruling party, the propaganda machine, press, and radio. But the political leader is the main conductor of nationalist ideas. The reasons are easily seen. Personalisation of nationalism derives largely from the low degree of social differentiation, the feudal survivals in the ideology, and the all but mystical deification of the leader.

The other typical feature is that religious ideas continue to be prominent.

Those are the peculiarities of nationalism on the African continent. On the face of it, the phenomenon is still homogeneous. And this has its explanation. Nearly all African countries present a medium not only for prolonged stagnation, but also for a further development, of nationalism.

Let us look at this from another angle.

To begin with, the dependence of African states on developed capitalist countries has not ended. Coming to grips with monopoly capital, the national bourgeoisie and national revolutionary democrats will still for a long time need to use nationalism as an ideological weapon. And such things as unequal trade and the continued existence of military blocs, will also be a spur for nationalism.

Different ways of socio-economic development, contradictions of a political and ideological nature, rivalry between leaders, and arbitrary frontiers inherited from the colonial regime—all this has already whetted nationalist contradictions between states.

Besides, contradictions and prejudices continue to exist between ethnic groups and nationalities in nearly all countries. All the African states comprise an agglomeration of ethnic groups speaking different languages. Each group watches jealously over proportional representation in government institutions; the slightest change arouses suspicion and resentment.

As we see, the factors that breed nationalism are highly

virulent. It is clear, in fact, that nationalism, whatever its form, will prevail in Africa for many years to come.

But the outward identity of its specific features cannot obscure the accelerated growth of different tendencies. The social and economic alternatives lead to a differentiation of forces.

The period immediately after independence was marked by the appearance of several divergent trends, with different classes trying to use nationalism differently in theory and practice, and in their psychological conditioning of the masses.

It is no longer right to say that nationalism in Africa is purely a nationalism of oppressed peoples. True, it is very difficult to find the divide between the different tendencies. Their evolution reflects the incompleteness of the formation of classes, their immaturity, on the one hand, and the mobility of the different social strata in African society today, on the other.

Identifying some of these tendencies, we wish to stress that after independence intrinsic class contradictions in the individual countries began to play a bigger role. Geographical, regional, ethnic and religious disparities in the manifestations of nationalism are mainly things of a bygone day. They may have survived, but are receding to the background, and giving place to class distinctions. The appearance of different tendencies in present-day nationalism, true of the continent as a whole, reveals its class essence and proves that Africa, too, despite its distinctiveness, will not escape the operation of the main objective laws governing social development. These ideological tendencies occur in most of the African countries, though only one, dominant at this or that stage of development, is distinguishable and is resisted by the other tendencies.

**The African
Tiller and
Nationalism**

Peasants make up 80 to 90 per cent of the population of Africa, especially its tropical part. Therefore, no important social or economic problem can be resolved without their active support. And it is natural that nearly all African po-

liticians and ideologues consider the mood of the peasants, and use them for their own class aims.

Certain African nationalists try to express what are most of all the interests of peasants.

Their conceptions may not be identical, but are the same in content and motivation. Some of them portray the absence of private landownership in many parts of Africa, and the consequent absence among peasants of a slavish obsession with their plots, as an exclusive feature of the African personality.

Idealising the African commune and its relations, and overlooking the rapid social differentiation in the African village, these people construct nationalist-type socialist theories. They accentuate the specific features of this "national socialism", and contrast them to scientific socialism. In other words, there is still much more nationalism than socialism in their thinking. At least at the present stage. And their doctrines are probably more accurately described as "socialist nationalism" than "national socialism". They are really an attempt to "align" socialism with nationalism.

Elements of nationalism are present in the theory and practice of quite a number of African states.

Socially, it mostly takes the form of idealisation of the peasant and his commune, in which many African nationalists seem to espy all but ready-made forms of socialism. That, indeed, is the foundation of the various theories of "African socialism".

Theories that developed outside the continent are rejected as alien. The specific features of "African" thinking, African culture and tradition, are treated as an absolute.

The goal of Africanising government implies that all top positions are to be occupied exclusively by Africans. Their ideological and political orientation, even their competence, are a secondary consideration.

In many fields everything foreign is deeply suspect. For example, all foreign aid, including aid from socialist countries, is thought to pursue selfish ends.

The "exclusiveness of the African peasantry", exaggeration of the peasant's role in revolution and derogation of the role of the working class, counterposing the peasant to the worker, are all meant to justify certain official practices. Conceiving socialism as a society of "poor but equal" people, certain ideologues set out to build "national socialism" by "big leaps", while denying people incentives for productive labour and advocating egalitarianism.

How to treat this conflicting type of nationalism? There is nothing simpler than to call it petty-bourgeois nationalism and draw the usual conclusions, similar to those on other continents and in other times. This is a tempting approach, because the apostles of this nationalism come from a petty-bourgeois milieu, and their arguments are strikingly similar to those of petty-bourgeois ideologues.

But despite the outward resemblance, it would hardly be right to identify communal and petty-bourgeois nationalisms. To begin with, the former is patterned on the communal mode of production rather than petty-bourgeois small-scale commodity production.

The difference between the two is probably more apparent after a closer look at the African peasantry. Only in a few parts of Northern Africa private landownership spread to some extent. But even so, land relations differ from those in Western Europe.

South of the Sahara, however, communal forms of landownership still predominate. The communal peasant is first and foremost a labourer, only rarely a proprietor. If any petty bourgeoisie does exist, then only in towns: merchants, shopkeepers, artisans, the lower bureaucracy, and so on. The village is of a pre-capitalist type. This complementary fact should help define the particular variety of nationalism we are now dealing with.

But while stressing that there is a special nationalism expressive of the interests of communal peasants, we would not think of denying the existence also of a definite extent of petty-bourgeois nationalism.

There is scarcely a political leader in Africa today who would venture to publicly favour capitalism. The vast majority of African nationalists have adopted the socialist vocabulary, and socialist slogans. Theories of "national socialism" mushroomed overnight—the Negritude ideas of Léopold Senghor in Senegal, the Destour socialism of Bourguiba in Tunisia, etc. The group of ideologues and politicians behind these theories may be classed under a separate head, that of African bourgeois nationalism. Their "national socialism" is compounded with other "theories".

**The African
Bourgeoisie
and Nationalism**

The widespread nationalist concepts of Africa's "specific" development and the exclusiveness of African socialism, the theory of the third way, of mixed economy, and the like, exaggerate the African identity, and African socialism, and are clearly directed against Marxism-Leninism.

The apostles of "national socialisms" decry Marxism for its materialism which, they contend, is incompatible with the "religious African soul". They say scientific socialism suppresses freedom, is totalitarian, etc. They espouse the theory of "rich and poor" nations, deny class struggle and criticise aid from the socialist countries. Most of their accusations have long been in use among bourgeois ideologues in the developed capitalist countries.

This variety of African nationalism is easily explained. After independence some of the bourgeois political parties became ruling parties. They began forming governments, nominating candidates to parliament, etc. In a matter of several years there appeared a corrupt bureaucratic parliamentary bourgeoisie. And, we might add that neo-colonialism supported this process.

Favourable conditions began to appear for local private capital. Land and real estate speculation flourished. Imperialist aid became a source of wealth for members of the ruling elite.

These socio-economic changes of the first ten years after independence tended to strengthen the reactionary element

in African nationalism. The nationalism of the African bourgeoisie evolved rapidly. In the case of Senghor, one of the makers of the Negritude theory, we found pride in African civilisation and the noble features of the African character, even the demand of a definite place for African culture in world civilisation. But this in his writings of the thirties. Later, these progressive elements were much less distinct, or vanished entirely. In one of his latest books, Senghor says Africa's unification is impossible on an anti-imperialist basis. If anything will unite the peoples of Africa, he says, it is the old African civilisation, its art, the specific African mentality.

The authors of such theories come around to the view that "European rationalism", which impels growth of science and technology, must blend with "African humanism". Turning to the imperialist West, they try to show the essential differences between the peoples of the Arab countries of Africa and the peoples south of the Sahara. This adds nationalist overtones to their theories, and in some cases artificially opposes Black Africa to the Arab countries.

In the fifties Houphouët-Boigny worked in harmony with progressive organisations in France, among them the French Communist Party. Later, he drifted away from anti-imperialist positions and became an outspoken advocate of capitalist development, a zealous champion of the interests of the local bourgeoisie. It was his position, in fact, that helped the French colonialists to "balkanise" Africa. There was a definite nationalist undercurrent in Houphouët-Boigny's policy and practice.

The Ivory Coast bourgeoisie did not want to share French subsidies with poorer African countries. In the sixties, in fact, this trend of richer countries standing off poorer neighbouring states was seen in many fields—relations with France, in the framework of the OAU, etc.

Thus, in most of the countries nationalism began to perform a new function: ideologically to justify the birth and growth of the local bourgeoisie. Shelved were questions of the anti-imperialist struggle—an expression of the protest of a weaker national bourgeoisie reluctant to share profits

with its incomparably more powerful competitor, monopoly capital.

The common feature was an exaggerated conception of African exclusiveness. Socialist rhetoric about regulating and planning the state sector became a screen for the anti-democratic content of nationalist doctrines. In social content this trend was the ideology of the national bourgeoisie, with nationalism as the main alternative to scientific socialism and the slogan of national unity as a means of obscuring class contradictions and concealing the class struggle.

The national bourgeoisie took its arguments from the ideological arsenals of developed capitalism. But first they had to be adapted to the African conditions, clothed in national garb. Nor were the imperialists troubled by the socialist colouring of some of the doctrines.

Nationalism had shed its progressive features and became the local exploiters' instrument for enslaving the masses.

More recently, the African press has been critical of nationalism. Ambroise Agboton, the Dahomey politician, for example, wrote that "nationalism sometimes leads to an underestimation, even contempt of other nations, complicates international relations, and ideologically creates international friction. The excesses of nationalism are censurable as a sign and consequence of an excessive attachment to a restricted community."¹

Alioune Sène, a Senegalese public figure, said: "In effect, nationalism may here and there attain such intensity as to become venomous. . . . It becomes a negative sentiment against foreigners in general."²

The anti-imperialist and anti-colonial content of this variety of African nationalism becomes muted. No longer is it a determining feature. Suggestions that it is a nationalism of oppressed nations will hardly help us determine the correct attitude to the national bourgeoisie in general, and its ideology in particular.

¹ *Afrique nouvelle*, June 27-July 3, 1968.

² *Dakar-Matin*, April 18, 1969.

We are farthest from the thought of ignoring the contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and imperialism. Certainly, such contradictions exist. But they are not antagonistic, though they do compel some African governments to make progressive moves in home and foreign policy. They are progressive, because objectively directed against the excessive power of foreign monopoly. And Marxists certainly support those aspects in home and foreign policy that benefit the struggle for national independence.

But not so in the ideological domain. Though recognising and supporting certain positive elements in the home and foreign policy of the national bourgeoisie, Marxists oppose any and all bourgeois ideology, whatever its background. That seems to be the determining factor in our attitude to the nationalism of the African bourgeoisie. The dangers of its anti-communist orientation are known to the progressive forces in modern Africa. Speaking at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, a representative of the Congolese Party of Labour (CPL) exposed anti-communist attempts to isolate the national liberation movement in Africa. "The CPL holds," he said, "that anti-communism in the national liberation movement is criminal. Our party and people will not accept philosophical concepts and concoctions aimed at isolating Africans from the rest of the world. We are builders. The main thing are the people. And we cannot afford to live apart from the rest of the world on the pretext of Negro exclusiveness, or to oppose the universal validity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching."

**National
Revolutionary
Democrats
and Nationalism**

The truly revolutionary exponents of African nationalism have opted for the socialist orientation. Now that the national liberation movement has advanced far enough, they are looking for ways and forms of passing from colonial capitalism to socialism.

No matter how varied the views of national democrats may be, they represent a definite current, which might be described as a transition in Africa's social thinking from nationalist ideology to scientific socialism.

What are its distinctive features?

Its anti-imperialist, anti-colonial content is clear. But as a rule it goes much further than even communal nationalism. In recent years, various of its ideologues have acknowledged the validity of the universal objective laws of the period of transition to socialism, the necessity and inevitability of class struggle in Africa and its leading place in the revolutionary struggle of the people, first of all the working class. Their approach to religion, too, has shifted closer to that of Marxists-Leninists. Many of them accept the fact that there can be only one socialism—scientific socialism.

They acknowledge African traditions, but do not sanctify them, acting more as patriots fond of their country's past, rather than nationalists, who give precedence to national traditions over the laws of social development. Yet while expressing the interests of different social groups (workers, peasants, intellectuals), they are themselves of petty-bourgeois origin.

So, despite the positive aspects of their evolution, they have not been able to wipe out vestiges of nationalism in both theory and practice.

Take the "self-reliance" slogan with its often nationalist overtones. Is it not liable to result in self-isolation from the world communist movement? Also fairly frequent is the habit of exaggerating the role of the national liberation revolution, or of taking purely utilitarian advantage of the contradictions between the two world systems.

However, though aware of the nationalist tendencies among revolutionary democrats, we appreciate the serious steps they have taken to assure closer ties with scientific socialism.

Some of the African ideologists' and politicians' closeness to Marxism is a notable new feature of the national liberation revolution. It reflects an objective process, for in some African countries the revolution for national liberation has now come to the verge of social revolution. It is therefore hardly right to say that theorists of this type are pure nationalists. The content and orientation of their theories are

much closer to the proletarian than to bourgeois ideology. And that is the point that should determine our attitude.

**African Marxists
and the National
Element**

The swiftly developing national liberation revolution in Africa is creating difficult problems for African Marxists and their parties. The success and in-

fluence of any Marxist party, including those in Africa, depends on its ability to harmonise the national and international, and to balance the national with the class aspects of the revolutionary struggle.

Marxist parties in Africa are often persecuted by home reaction. Also, they are exposed to strong pressures from nationalists. And it would be an unforgivable mistake to think that all the Communist parties on the continent are immune to the nationalist contagion. First of all, they are still relatively young. Further, the proletariat in their countries, especially the industrial proletariat, is still in its formative stages. As a rule, too, it is petty-bourgeois nationalists who are in power, and who control the mass media, the press and propaganda.

In view of the pervasive cultural backwardness, religious fanaticism and national and tribal prejudices, it is much more difficult for Marxists to conduct their explanatory work in Africa than it is in the developed countries. Working for influence over the masses in these peculiar conditions, it is easy to slip into nationalism. Simple nationalist slogans relating to, say, border disputes, are more comprehensible to the African peasant than the scientific concepts of class struggle, which require continuous and patient elucidation. The Israeli aggression has aroused entirely legitimate patriotism in the Arab countries, but it has also given a lease of life to extreme nationalism. And for the Arab Marxists this poses exceedingly difficult problems.

In respect of the activities of Marxist parties in Africa, we should not close our eyes to certain other factors that may in definite circumstances cause nationalistic aberrations. We know, for instance, that due to the force of attraction of scientific socialism, people of petty-bourgeois background, in-

tellectuals, peasants, office workers and traders, are joining the communist movement along with proletarian elements. Also, aware of the growing popularity of Marxism across the world, many anarchists, neo-Trotskyites and other extremists are trying to cash in on its successes. The Marxist parties must therefore be especially vigilant against the slightest sign of nationalism in their ranks.

We should remember, furthermore, that some African Marxist parties had at one time neglected the national aspects of the revolutionary struggle. Rectifying these errors, they may go to the other extreme—overestimate and over-accentuate national factors, thus creating the danger of nationalism.

We have already said that in Africa, too, the views of national democrats are moving closer to scientific socialism. African Marxists have contributed immensely to this. They are the immediate bearers of scientific socialism on the continent. And it is therefore of crucial importance for them to see the relation between the international and national. Any departure from scientific Marxist positions would, in effect, mean a concession to nationalism rather than convergence of the revolutionary streams.

These difficulties are not really objective reasons that necessarily produce nationalist aberrations in communist ranks. Manifestations of nationalism in the communist movement, whether in Africa or elsewhere, are in fact a subjective interpretation of definite national conditions, a groundless and unjustifiable departure from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The African Marxists' attitude to the events in Nigeria was a model of how to apply Lenin's national question theory. They did not hesitate to come out against nationalism and separatism. *The African Communist*, journal of the South African Communists, wrote:

"Marxists do not support any and all 'national' movements. We support national movements that in the concrete situation are progressive. In the Nigeria situation the question to be asked is whether the secession of 'Biafra' is a pro-

gressive movement which helps the general struggle for emancipation of the African people not only in Nigeria but in the whole of Africa. The answer to this question does not depend on the 'progressiveness' or 'modernity' of this or that group. The entire working class of the world supported the struggle of the Ethiopians against fascist Italy without reservation. This was irrespective of the fact that concretely Ethiopia was a backward, feudal monarchy in which the masses suffered slavery and oppression. Similarly, the fact that Israel is a modern state cannot be a reason for supporting its policy as against that of relatively backward states who may surround it. . . .

"There is no evidence whatsoever that a break-up of Nigeria will assist the democratic movement in Nigeria. On the contrary, the secession will definitely have serious economic, political and other disadvantages in Nigeria, will rob the progressive movement in that country of some of its most politically active and progressive contingents; deprive Africa of its huge giant country which has a potential that could be of profound significance in the Africa of the future. To speak as if secession is a break from the feudalists in the North is nonsense. This is to jumble up the millions of labouring workers and peasants in 'Biafra' and the rest of Nigeria with the reactionaries in the ruling classes."¹

The regions and provinces into which Nigeria's federal government has divided the country provide a realistic basis for self-determination. It might be worth recalling Lenin on this score, who said that "far from precluding local self-government, with *autonomy* for regions having special economic and social conditions, a distinct national composition of the population, and so forth, democratic centralism necessarily demands *both*".²

Concluding this brief examination of nationalism in Africa, we should like to dwell on those of its aspects that will clarify our attitude.

¹ Albert Zanzolo, "African Unity Now", *The African Communist*, No. 36, 1969, pp. 22-23.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 46.

Though in essence nationalism can be neither African nor Asian nor European, the nationalism in Africa differs in many ways from the "classical" Western nationalism. It is anti-imperialist and anti-foreign; its origin and development are different, and so is its social-economic background; the social forces among which it prevails are different, too.

There have been progressive as well as reactionary elements in its content at all stages. During the struggle against foreign oppression, for political independence, it was one of the ideological expressions of the general national demands. This was a period when it displayed its most progressive elements, first of all its democratic character and its anti-imperialist, anti-colonial orientation, deriving from the social content of the national liberation struggle. But nationalist features, too, began to grow at this time: the belief in Africa's exclusiveness, rejection of class struggle, "black" racism, anti-communism, and idealisation of the traditional African culture.

After independence, nationalism retained some of its progressive elements, particularly its anti-imperialist orientation, for some time. But the reactionary elements—the theory of Africa's particular development, "national socialism" and, of course, anti-communism—began to grow visibly.

At present, there is an accelerated differentiation and polarisation of social forces. Different ideological trends appear all the time.

There are two essential tendencies. Some African theorists and politicians are gravitating towards national revolutionary democracy, and some towards bourgeois nationalism and bourgeois ideology.

Bourgeois nationalism predominates. And its reactionary features are becoming more distinct. Though it has retained a degree of its anti-imperialist orientation, it is already inflicting tremendous damage on the revolutionary movement in Africa and the unity of the world revolutionary forces.

But on some key issues many national democrats are moving away from their nationalist positions closer to the ideology of scientific socialism. They operate increasingly as patri-

ots who have opted for the socialist orientation, rather than as nationalists.

We have mentioned the existence of the petty bourgeoisie, especially in African towns. There is also a fairly large petty-bourgeois stratum in rural areas, especially in Northern Africa. And naturally, it has also tried to take advantage of nationalism for its class aims. Despite the common features and many coinciding views, however, the peasants of the primitive commune and the petty bourgeoisie express interests that, though they are close, are still the interests of different classes. This is reflected in their theories and in practice, in the technique and method of influencing the African masses.

Both trends, for example, draw a line of distinction between the specific features of Africa and the universal laws governing the development of the revolutionary process.

But the spokesmen of the commune peasants idealise subsistence farming and oppose private property, while the exponents of petty-bourgeois nationalism set Africa apart from other continents, because, they aver, capitalist relations are absent in the African village. They are not opposed to private ownership of the means of production. All they want is justice in the distribution of the national product.

Events have shown that many of the theorists and politicians who had been zealous exponents of nationalism are liable to shift to national democracy, and that their views may move closer to scientific socialism. It should be stressed, however, that the evolution towards national democracy, and then towards scientific socialism, is probably more difficult for representatives of the peasants of the primitive commune. This is probably the reason why we must differentiate between these related, but certainly not identical, trends in African nationalism.

CONCLUSION

The greater the revolutionary movement of liberation, the more frantic become imperialist attempts to suppress or disrupt it, and the more ferocious the counter-attacks of the capitalist class, which is joining forces to delay the downfall of world imperialism.

Nationalism, which has become the common denominator of the centrifugal tendencies of both the dogmatic and the revisionist trends, is to be, as imperialist strategists conceive it, the decisive factor in "softening up" the revolutionary forces, and first of all their main bulwark, the socialist system.

And because monopoly capital is forging broad international imperialist alliances against the socialist countries, the revolutionary working-class and the national liberation movement, it is particularly necessary to work for the internationalist unity of the revolutionary forces. "*The working class, the democratic and revolutionary forces, the peoples must unite and act jointly in order to put an end to imperialism's criminal actions which can bring still graver suffering to mankind.*"¹

For the struggle against nationalism to be successful, the three main revolutionary streams of our time must be united. Also required is the intrinsic unity of each of them.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 21.

Proletarian internationalism is the cornerstone of the strategy and tactics of the international working class, all working people.

Proletarian internationalism was first proclaimed and substantiated by Marx and Engels at the end of 1845. "Fraternalisation between nations," wrote Engels in "The Festival of Nations in London", "has today, more than ever, a purely social significance."¹ Engels showed that the plans of a "European republic" were unrealistic. So was the idea of "perpetual peace" in a capitalist Europe. He showed that "the proletarians of all nations, without too much ceremony, are already *really* beginning to *fraternise* under the banner of communist democracy".²

In their speeches on Poland, and in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels traced the background of the workers' internationalist positions, and also the causes and aims of the struggle against the bourgeoisie, their common enemy. The slogan, Workers of the World, Unite!, which they formulated in the *Manifesto*, became the motto of proletarian internationalism.

Lenin worked out the question of the unity of the national and international tasks of the working class, the harmony between patriotism and internationalism. Proletarian internationalism, he stressed, requires balance between the interests of the proletarian struggle in one country and the same interests in other countries, and the interests of the entire communist and working-class movement. Lenin's guidelines on the interrelation of national and international tasks were followed by the Bolshevik Party in Russia in its *revolutionary* practice against the tsarist autocracy.

There are several main aspects to proletarian internationalism, as we conceive it on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and the revolutionary experience of the international working class.

First, it is a *type of relationship* between national detach-

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 6.

² *Ibid.*

ments of the working class characterised in general terms by consistent solidarity of the workers of one country and workers of other countries in the struggle against capitalism and imperialism, for national and social liberation, and also by the readiness and ability of the working class and its party to subordinate national interests to international interests.

Second, it is the *revolutionary practice of the joint struggle* of the workers of different countries against world imperialism.

Third, it is a *sense of workers' world-wide solidarity*, deriving from the community of their basic interests.

Fourth, it is a scientifically-grounded *ideology of the community of the basic interests of the working class of all countries and nations*.

The principles of proletarian internationalism develop continuously. They become broader and more precise in the course of the varied and complex process of relations between the national detachments of the working class, and under the influence of the world-wide contention between socialism and capitalism.

The party and its leadership must constantly deal with and understand the correlation of the national and international; it must be quick to see the danger of nationalist tendencies before they arise or fight them if they do arise. And the measure of its maturity depends not only on the ability to recognise the existing principles of proletarian internationalism, but, first and foremost, on creatively following the spirit of the central idea and on appreciating the specific quality of any current phase (which gives priority now to one and now to another aspect of proletarian internationalism) without losing sight of the whole system of principles.

Nothing but a correct combination of national interests with the interests of the international struggle will assure faithful observance of Marxist-Leninist principles. But in some cases, the understanding of this combination of the national and international does not entirely coincide with Lenin's understanding of this correlation, with the understanding of the other Communist and Workers' parties today.

This is due to the national being allowed to take precedence. Exaggeration of the national, however, is tantamount to a departure from class positions, a shift towards nationalism.

Everybody in the communist and working-class movement today professes to be internationalist, and nearly everybody acknowledges the grave danger of nationalist deviations. But revolutionary practice is what distinguishes real internationalism from false. The main criterion of proletarian internationalism is the class approach to the national.

With the emergence of the world's first socialist state, the Soviet Union, the class approach of the world proletariat to the question of relations between that state and the capitalist countries meant that to defend the Soviet Union is to defend socialism. And for many dozens of years this has been one of the main criteria of proletarian internationalism.

Having built socialism, the peoples of the Soviet Union have entered the period of communist construction. This adds to the international role and significance of the Soviet state.

The criteria of proletarian internationalism are not immutable. They are broadened by the development of the world communist movement. The emergence of the world socialist system has consolidated the positions of the Communist and Workers' parties throughout the world. In the past, the liberation and revolutionary movement had the support of just one socialist country. Now it can count on the support and aid of the many countries that comprise the socialist community.

Today, an internationalist recognises the necessity of consistently supporting the countries of the socialist community, of cooperating with them. The true internationalist does so in practice. The attitude to the system of socialist states is also a criterion of proletarian internationalism. Faithful to the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the world communist movement has worked out a new slogan conforming with the present, richer conception of revolutionary proletarian internationalism: "Peoples of the socialist countries, workers of the world, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly-free and oppressed peoples—unite in the common struggle

against imperialism, for peace, national independence, social progress, democracy and socialism!"

There are, of course, many more criteria of proletarian internationalism. One of them is struggle for world revolutionary progress, which brings closer the day of capitalism's downfall. It is the internationalist duty of countries that have thrown off capitalism to support the revolutionary forces fighting for social emancipation.

Internationalism, as we have said, does not oppose the national, the national interests. While it is an irreconcilable foe of nationalism, it is invariably the champion and vehicle of national aspirations, the national liberation movement. For this reason, recognition and support by the revolutionary forces of the national interests of each people fighting against its enemies is also a criterion of internationalism.

The Communist parties of the socialist countries are the main pillar of the liberation and revolutionary movement in the world. But their efforts alone are not enough to secure peace and social progress on earth. Only the world communist and working-class revolutionary movement as a whole can do so. Hence the importance of the unity of its vanguard, the Communist and Workers' parties.

Imperialism hopes that disunity in the world communist movement will help it survive and perhaps buttress its position. This is the reason behind the strategy of striking simultaneously at the Communist parties of socialist countries, and at the world communist and working-class movement as a whole in order to divide the communist vanguards of the working class in different countries.

There has been a past instance (the collapse of the Second International) when departures from class positions, a break with scientific communism, resulted in that strong and massive parties forgot the principles of proletarian internationalism, and drifted towards nationalism and chauvinism, the natural results of division.

In our time, the Communist and Workers' parties have enough experience in combating difficulties stemming from nationalist phenomena, and also in organising mutual rela-

tions in accordance with the principles of proletarian internationalism. This experience shows that the fundamental Leninist principle of the internationalist class approach to national problems is as relevant as ever in this day of global confrontation between the capitalist and socialist worlds.

The 1969 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out that there were sufficient objective preconditions for strengthening the unity of the communist movement. However, it would be wrong for the movement to confine itself to the mere registration of coinciding views and interests. Unity will not come about by itself. It has to be fought for.

Study and use of the experience of the world revolutionary movement in asserting the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism is a reliable way of strengthening the unity of the Communist parties and overcoming nationalist tendencies. Clearly, each party makes its own contribution to the world communist movement, imparting specific and characteristic features. Given the same basic principles and the same vital interests, this abundance and diversity of revolutionary experience assures the richness and viability of world communism. Each party may draw on this common international store of experience, taking what it needs, enriching itself through the experience of fraternal Communist parties.

The 1969 International Meeting has helped significantly to reinforce the unity of the communist movement in line with the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The preparations for the Meeting were also significant in the fight for communist unity, against nationalism and other deviations. The democratic principles of equal rights and mutual respect, coupled with a sincere wish to reach mutual understanding, were the highlights of this preparatory work. And the broad discussion at the Meeting itself, the documents it adopted, showed that the fraternal parties are capable of correct solutions for their problems, are determined to solve them creatively and in good time, taking guidance in the principles of Marxism-Leninism and

reckoning with the concrete conditions in each country and with the international situation as a whole.

Regional conferences of Communist and Workers' parties are also highly important for the struggle against nationalism and against departures from proletarian, socialist internationalism. They are, in fact, an essential link in the chain of measures carried by the world communist movement. They are necessary, first of all, because groups of parties face questions only they have in common, and which only they can discuss and resolve. Second, any positive result achieved by one group of Communist parties is beneficial also for all the other Communist parties.

Apart from world and regional conferences there are many other forms of relation between parties, in which they compare notes and work out the best solutions. Bilateral meetings, for example, have proved very useful.

The international unity of Communists is based on their ideological, Marxist-Leninist unity. Yet, ideological unity is difficult to practise if there is no immediate cooperation by people directly engaged in working out new propositions, or studying and extending those already tested in practice. Need we say, therefore, how useful cooperation is between communist scholars? Some positive experience has been registered in this field. There have been interesting and fruitful discussions of Marxist scholars in Prague, under the auspices of the world communist journal, *World Marxist Review*. Parties have also exchanged delegations of scholars directly.

The greater maturity of the Communist parties of the world made it unnecessary to have a leading organisational centre. But this does not make joint work by scholars of different Communist parties less useful. Their work is bound to contribute to the study of the appearance or revival of nationalist tendencies in present-day conditions, and certainly to the search for effective measures against them in the ranks of the communist and working-class movement.

Consistent practice of proletarian, socialist internationalism is the best way to eliminate nationalism. This was so in the past. It is also true today. In fact, one of the most effec-

tive ways to combat nationalist tendencies, to consolidate the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties, is joint action for universal peace, for democracy and socialism, and against the aggressive designs of world imperialism. Lenin said: "Differences within or between political parties are usually resolved not only by polemics over principles, but also by the course of political developments; it will, in fact, be more correct to say: not so much by the first as by the second."¹

Recent events have again shown that Lenin was right. It was the political reality, the very course of events that resulted in the practical isolation of "left" doctrinaires in the ranks of the world communist movement. It would be a mistake to think, of course, that this came about by itself. It took deliberate practical action to achieve the desired result.

The anti-imperialist struggle provides ample scope for effective mass action by Communist parties. This tends to strengthen international unity, deepen international ties, and stimulate revolutionary activity. One such world-wide undertaking, which encompassed all progressive forces, was the celebration of the centenary of Lenin's birth.

Other measures include the far-flung struggle of the masses organised by Communist and Workers' parties for peace, against nuclear war, for European collective security, the dissolution of military blocs, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from invaded Arab territories, the elimination of poverty zones, and more effective aid to underdeveloped countries.

Regional groups of Communist and Workers' parties, too, have common tasks. One of the tasks of the Communist and Workers' parties of Europe, for example, is to stimulate activity in favour of European security and related objectives formulated at the Karlovy Vary Conference and the sessions of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee.

Communist parties working underground also need international support. This is a good sphere for joint action. Speaking at the 1969 Meeting, Comrade Enrique Gil, of the Communist Party of Ecuador, stressed the tremendous sig-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 133 (in Russian).

nificance of communist international solidarity for that little Latin American country. International proletarian solidarity, he said, not only "helped us free from prison and rescue from torture our dear leaders and other victims of the dictatorship. But solidarity was manifested also in the fraternal hospitality accorded men forced to leave the country. International solidarity was an inspiration to underground party workers and the few Central Committee leaders who managed to escape the terror. It helped us marshal the necessary forces not only to resist the dictatorship, but, more important, to fight for its overthrow."¹

The practice of proletarian internationalism, as we see, is concentrated in the relations between the many Communist parties and the peoples. The Marxist-Leninist party of our time is an internationalist party, for which, Lenin said, "struggle with opportunist, pacifist philistine distortions of the concept and policy of internationalism is the cardinal and most important task".

* * *

It takes the concerted effort of communist internationalists to defeat nationalism. Name-calling is not enough. To overcome nationalism we require a thorough objective analysis of the causes of nationalist deviations among Communists, and must work out effective measures blended with a sense of tact, mutual respect and consideration.

Nationalism has many faces. It is highly complex. There is no ready-made prescription against it. There must be a concrete approach to each separate case, to each form of nationalism. This is essential if the struggle against nationalism is to be effective.

The history of the world, the experience of mankind, show that genuine internationalist education and consistent struggle against nationalism are possible only on the basis of socialism, under the guidance of the world communist movement, that there is no other way to end nationalism.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 88.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

PUT OUT RECENTLY

PROGRESS. THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST
AND WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The Working Class—the Leading Force of the World Revolutionary Process (A Critique of Bourgeois and Reformist Conceptions)

This book is written by research workers of the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement and analyses the bourgeois and reformist conceptions of the “deproletarianisation” of the working class and its “integration” into the capitalist system. The book describes the processes determining the make-up and development tendencies of today’s working class, and its role in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and social progress.

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

PUT OUT RECENTLY

PROGRESS. THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST
AND WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

Leninism and the World Revolutionary Working-Class Movement

The book gives an account of Lenin's elaboration of the principles of strategy and tactics in the revolutionary working-class movement, of the process of unification on the basis of Leninism of the leading forces in the international working class, and of the birth and development of the world communist movement. Drawing on the wealth of Lenin's writings the authors discuss the statements which are crucial for an understanding of the contemporary problems in the struggle for proletarian unity and the consolidation of the anti-imperialist front.

The book contains articles by M. Suslov, W. Rochet, W. Ulbricht and Gus Hall.

Художественный редактор *В. Камкина*
Технический редактор *Г. Кочеткова*

Подписано к печати 18/XII-1975 г. Формат 84×108¹/₃₂.
Бум. л. 4¹/₂. Печ. л. 15,12.
Уч.-изд. л. 15,13. Изд. № 18876. Заказ 2423.
Цена 1 р. 50 к.

Издательство «Прогресс»
Государственного комитета Совета Министров СССР
по делам издательств, полиграфии
и книжной торговли.
Москва, Г-21, Зубовский бульвар, 21.
Ордена Трудового Красного Знамени
Московская типография № 7 «Искра революции»
«Союзполиграфпрома» при Государственном комитете
Совета Министров СССР по делам издательств,
полиграфии и книжной торговли
Москва, Г-19, пер. Аксакова, 13